

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

**NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
REGISTRATION FORM**

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations for individual properties and districts. See instructions in How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form (National Register Bulletin 16A). Complete each item by marking "x" in the appropriate box or by entering the information requested. If any item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, architectural classification, materials, and areas of significance, enter only categories and subcategories from the instructions. Place additional entries and narrative items on continuation sheets (NPS Form 10-900a). Use a typewriter, word processor, or computer, to complete all items.

1. Name of Property

historic name: BATTERSEA

other names/site number VDHR File # 123-0059

2. Location

street & number 1289 Upper Appomattox Street not for publication N/A

city or town Petersburg vicinity
state Virginia code VA county Independent City code 730 Zip 23803

3. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1986, as amended, I hereby certify that this X nomination request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property X meets does not meet the National Register Criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant X nationally X statewide X locally. (See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Signature of certifying official _____ Date _____

Virginia Department of Historic Resources

State or Federal agency and bureau

In my opinion, the property meets does not meet the National Register criteria. (See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Signature of commenting or other official _____ Date _____

State or Federal agency and bureau

4. National Park Service Certification

I, hereby certify that this property is:

 entered in the National Register

 See continuation sheet.

 determined eligible for the National Register

Signature of Keeper _____

 See continuation sheet.

 determined not eligible for the National Register

Date of Action _____

 removed from the National Register

 other (explain): _____

U. S. Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceBATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia**5. Classification****Ownership of Property** (Check as many boxes as apply)

- ☐ private
☒ public-local
☐ public-State
☐ public-Federal

Category of Property (Check only one box)

- ☒ building(s)
☐ district
☐ site
☐ structure
☐ object

Number of Resources within Property

Contributing	Noncontributing
<u>2</u>	<u>6</u> buildings
<u>2</u>	<u>2</u> sites
<u>0</u>	<u>2</u> structures
<u>0</u>	<u>0</u> objects
<u>4</u>	<u>10</u> Total

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register 1Name of related multiple property listing (Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing.) N/A**6. Function or Use****Historic Functions** (Enter categories from instructions)

Cat: <u>domestic</u>	Sub: <u>single-family dwelling</u>	<u>main house</u>
<u>domestic</u>	<u>secondary structure</u>	<u>kitchen</u>
<u>domestic</u>	<u>secondary structure</u>	<u>greenhouse</u>

Current Functions (Enter categories from instructions)

Cat: <u>work in progress</u>	Sub: <u>work in progress/vacant</u>	<u>main house – C</u>
<u>work in progress</u>	<u>work in progress/vacant</u>	<u>kitchen – C</u>
<u>work in progress</u>	<u>work in progress/vacant</u>	<u>greenhouse – C</u>
<u>other</u>	<u>other</u>	<u>stable site– C site</u>
<u>other</u>	<u>other</u>	<u>formal garden site – C site</u>
<u>vacant/not in use</u>	<u>vacant/not in use</u>	<u>2 concrete utility sheds – NC</u>
<u>other</u>	<u>other</u>	<u>garage/storage building – NC</u>
<u>other</u>	<u>other</u>	<u>guinea house ruin – NC site</u>
<u>vacant/not in use</u>	<u>vacant/not in use</u>	<u>southwest tenant house – NC</u>
<u>other</u>	<u>other</u>	<u>truck garage – NC</u>
<u>vacant/not in use</u>	<u>vacant/not in use</u>	<u>railroad storage building – NC</u>
<u>other</u>	<u>other</u>	<u>collapsed building – NC site</u>
<u>industry</u>	<u>energy facility</u>	<u>electric power substation – NC structure</u>
<u>other</u>	<u>other</u>	<u>fenced area – NC structure</u>

7. Description

Architectural Classification (Enter categories from instructions)

Colonial – Georgian
Early Republic – Early Classical Revival
Mid-19th Century – Greek Revival

Materials (Enter categories from instructions)

foundation brick
roof metal
walls brick and stucco
other brick and stucco chimneys

Narrative Description (Describe the historic and current condition of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria (Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing)

- ☒ X A Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- ☒ X B Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- ☒ X C Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.
- ☒ X D Property has yielded, or is likely to yield information important in prehistory or history.

Criteria Considerations (Mark "X" in all the boxes that apply.)

- ☐ A owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.
- ☐ B removed from its original location.
- ☐ C a birthplace or a grave.
- ☐ D a cemetery.
- ☐ E a reconstructed building, object or structure.
- ☐ F a commemorative property.
- ☐ G less than 50 years of age or achieved significance within the past 50 years.

**U. S. Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

Areas of Significance (Enter categories from instructions)

1. Politics/Government

3. Military

2. Architecture

4. Archaeology – Historic Aboriginal and Historic Non-Aboriginal

Period of Significance 1768-1847

Significant Dates 1768, 1781, 1824

Significant Person (Complete if Criterion B is marked above)

Banister, Colonel John

Cultural Affiliation Woodland Period

Anglo-American

African-American

Architect/Builder unknown

Narrative Statement of Significance (Explain the significance of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

9. Major Bibliographical References

Bibliography

(Cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form on one or more continuation sheets.)

Previous documentation on file (NPS)

___ preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested.

X previously listed in the National Register

_____ previously determined eligible by the National Register

designated a National Historic Landmark

X recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey # VA 136

recorded by Historic American Engineering Record # _____

Primary Location of Additional Data

X State Historic Preservation Office

Other State agency

Federal agency

Local government

University

Other

Name of repository: _____

10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property 35.5 acres

UTM References (Place additional UTM references on a continuation sheet)

Zone Easting Northing Zone Easting Northing Zone Easting Northing

1. E284635 N4122855

2. E284684 N4122806

3. E284718 N4122615

4. E284316 N4122416

5. E284255 N4122570

6. E284489 N4122785

See continuation sheet.

U. S. Department of the Interior
National Park Service

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

Verbal Boundary Description (Describe the boundaries of the property on a continuation sheet.)

Boundary Justification (Explain why the boundaries were selected on a continuation sheet.)

11. Form Prepared By

name/title: Christopher V. Novelli

Organization: _____ date September 20, 2005

street & number: 4321 Eighth Street telephone (804) 222-1757

city or town Richmond state VA zip code 23223

Additional Documentation

Submit the following items with the completed form:

Continuation Sheets

Maps

A USGS map (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location.

A sketch map for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources.

Photographs

Representative black and white photographs of the property.

Additional items (Check with the SHPO or FPO for any additional items)

Property Owner

(Complete this item at the request of the SHPO or FPO.)

name City of Petersburg

street & number City Hall 135 North Union Street telephone (804) 733-2308

city or town Petersburg state VA zip code 23803

=====
Paperwork Reduction Act Statement: This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.).

Estimated Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 18.1 hours per response including the time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Chief, Administrative Services Division, National Park Service, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reductions Project (1024-0018), Washington, DC 20503.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 7 Page 1**

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

7. SUMMARY DESCRIPTION:

Battersea is a substantial stuccoed brick house located north of Upper Appomattox Street in the city of Petersburg, near the south bank of the Appomattox River. Even though the 35.5-acre property is bordered by a 19th-century neighborhood and a light industrial area, it still retains its historic rural character. The house was built in 1768 for Colonel John Banister, the first mayor of Petersburg and a signer of the Articles of Confederation. Battersea was designed and built as a symmetrical five-part Palladian house featuring a two-story central block, one-story wings that act as hyphens, and one-and-a-half story end pavilions. One-story columned porticos mark the entrances on the front, back, and sides of the house. The plan of the interior reflects the five-part massing of the exterior, presenting a symmetrical single-pile plan with rooms extending to either side of the central block.

During the first half of the 19th century, a number of significant alterations were made to the interior and exterior to update the appearance of the house. Battersea, however, is a rare case in which subsequent changes enhanced rather than compromised the character of a house. On the exterior, the modifications gave the house an even stronger Palladian appearance than it had originally. On the interior, the most impressive Georgian features were kept; the added Federal and Greek Revival detailing was characterized by ornamental restraint. The house retains its architectural and structural integrity, but is showing signs of deterioration on the interior and exterior.

The nominated property includes, in addition to the house itself, two contributing outbuildings: a greenhouse and a kitchen, which may have additionally served as a laundry and servants' quarter. There are also two contributing sites. Historic evidence indicates that the south (front) yard comprises the site of an 18th-century formal garden. Evidence also indicates that a stable probably dating to the period of significance (1768-1847) was once located west of the house. There are six noncontributing outbuildings, two noncontributing sites and two noncontributing structures. These include a former tenant house, a number of 20th-century sheds and storage buildings, and an electric power substation.

DETAILED ARCHITECTURAL DESCRIPTION

CURRENT APPEARANCE

EXTERIOR

Battersea faces south on a large, level site. A single terrace extends across the front lawn. The land to the south and east of the house has been cleared, but the areas west and directly north are partially wooded and overgrown. Mature trees shade the yard around the house. The Battersea property is bounded on the north by the still active tracks of the Norfolk Southern Railroad (formerly the Southside Railroad), which extend along the south bank of the Appomattox River. It is bounded on the east by the North Battersea/Pride's Field National Register Historic District. The westernmost portion of the property is bounded by tracks of CSX Transportation (formerly the Atlantic Coastline Railroad). The southern part of the property is bounded by Upper Appomattox Street. Property surrounding former tenant houses to the southeast and southwest has been subdivided into two rectangular-shaped parcels. The parcel containing the southwest tenant house is 4.5 acres and is a part of the nominated property. A 2-acre parcel contain-

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 7 Page 2

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

ing another tenant house to the southeast of the main house was part of the Battersea property conveyed to the City of Petersburg. It is included within the boundaries of the North Battersea/Pride's Field National Register Historic District and is **not** a part of this nomination. The nominated Battersea property consists of the 4.5-acre parcel, together with the 31-acre parcel containing the main house.

The house rests upon a solid brick foundation and features Flemish-bond brick construction. During the 1840s, the brickwork was covered with stucco, which was scored to resemble coursed ashlar masonry. The lower portion of the building is pierced on all sides by 2-light basement windows and encircled by a molded brick water table. All of the porticos were built around 1824 to replace the original porticos. Accessed by stone steps, they rest upon brick piers and have recently-added tongue-and-groove decking. The roofs of the east, west, and north porticos are clad with standing-seam metal. The window openings feature wood sills and mostly 6-over-6 double-hung sash. Window casings are, with a few noted exceptions, symmetrical with turned corner blocks. The gauged-brick jack arches above the windows are now mostly obscured by stucco. A cornice with Ionic modillions and dentiled molding embellishes all five sections of the house. The lower portion of the cornice is original with only a few exceptions. Much of the crown molding and fascia, however, have been replaced. The central block of the house has a pyramidal, hipped roof; the hyphens have side-gable roofs; and the pavilions have front-gable roofs with pedimented gables. All of the roofs were clad around 1957 with standing-seam metal. Interior-end brick chimneys with stucco cladding accentuate the roofline. A Roman pinecone finial adorns the roof of the central block.¹

South (Front) Elevation

The five-part south elevation consists of the 3-bay wide central block flanked by hyphens with end pavilions. The central block is augmented by a 1-story, 3-bay wide portico with fluted Doric wood columns. Matching Doric pilasters mark the intersection of the portico with the body of the house. The entablature of the portico is divided into an architrave, frieze, and boxed cornice. The portico roof displays the remains of a balustrade with spindled balusters and urn newels with ball caps. The centered main entrance features paneled double-leaf doors and 3-light sidelights. The doors and sidelights feature symmetrical casings with turned corner blocks. An elliptical fanlight transom with scalloped tracery adorns the upper portion of the entrance. The entire ensemble is framed by raised-panel jambs and a raised-panel soffit which follows the curvature of the transom. The entrance is flanked by 6-over-6 double-hung sash windows. A brick string course is visible on either side of the portico roof. The second story features a glazed double-leaf door (once a window) and two flanking 6-over-6 double-hung sash windows.

The east and west hyphens are identical in design. Each features a large tripartite window composed of a 6-over-6 double-hung sash window with 2-over-2 double-hung sash sidelights. The east and west pavilions are also identical. They each display the same type of tripartite window, but with a semi-circular top over the center, suggesting the look of a Palladian window. The arched top of each Palladian window is false and not expressed on the interior. Both pavilions display pedimented gables with cornice molding.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 7 Page 3**

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

East Elevation

The 3-bay wide east elevation is distinguished by a 1-story, 1-bay wide portico. The detailing of the portico includes unfluted Roman Doric columns which support an entablature with a frieze, cornice, and pediment. There is no architrave. Spindled balustrades connect the front columns to matching pilasters on the body of the house. Alternating triglyphs and roundel metopes embellish the frieze, and block modillions adorn the cornice. The entrance on this side was converted into a triple-hung window around 1824 and is now covered by double-leaf louvers. The opening is framed by symmetrical casings with turned corner blocks. The portico is flanked by two former windows which were bricked in and outfitted with fixed louvered shutters. The window on the north side lost its shutters when it became an entrance to a 1-room bathroom addition built around 1890. This addition was removed around 1989. The attic is marked by two 6-light windows with 3-part architrave trim. These are the only windows on the house which retain their original sash and trim.

North (Rear) Elevation

The 3-bay wide center block is augmented by a centered 1-story, 1-bay portico with slender unfluted wood columns. Balustrades with squared balusters connect the columns on the front to matching half-columns on the body of the house. The upper part of the portico is embellished by a pediment and cornice with block modillions. The recessed north entrance features a paneled double-leaf door, an 8-light rectangular transom, and is framed by paneled jambs and a paneled soffit. The entrance is flanked by 6-over-6 double-hung sash windows. A string course divides the first story from the second, which is articulated by three symmetrically-spaced 6-over-6 double-hung sash windows with original architrave trim. By contrast, the first story windows have the same symmetrical trim as those on the front of the house.

The east and west hyphens and pavilions retain their original bay arrangement – each with two evenly-spaced 6-over-6 double-hung sash windows. This same configuration was originally repeated on the south (front) side of the house. Both pavilions feature pedimented gables with cornice molding. Interior-end brick chimneys with stucco cladding rise behind the gables.

West Elevation

The west elevation is almost identical to the east elevation, with an identical Roman Doric portico. The centered entrance features a single-leaf, paneled door below an 8-light rectangular transom. Both the door and transom are framed by architrave trim. The porch is flanked on the south side by a 6-over-6 double-hung sash window and, on the north, by a former window which has been bricked in and covered by fixed louvered shutters. Two 6-over-3 double-hung sash windows mark the second story.

INTERIOR

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places

Continuation Sheet

Section 7 Page 4

BATTERSEA

1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

The arrangement of interior spaces reflects the symmetrical five-part massing of the exterior. The central block is divided between a full-width entry and a large saloon. The saloon is accessed on the north and south sides by double-leaf doors in line with the main entrance, providing a breezeway through the central axis of the house. The flanking rooms were arranged in a linear fashion with the doors aligned *en filade* on a cross-axis along the southern side of the house. The detailing of the central block, east hyphen, and east pavilion is more elaborate, reflecting the higher status and formal use of these rooms. These are the only

rooms with plaster cornices and raised-panel window jambs and soffits. The comparatively simple detailing of the west hyphen and pavilion reflects the use of these rooms as service areas and private spaces for much of their history. All of the first floor rooms have paneled wainscoting and recessed windows with jambs and soffits. A full cellar exists beneath each room.

Entry

The entry contains the greatest concentration of original Georgian detailing on the interior, including the staircase, wainscoting, paneling, and entrance to the adjacent saloon. A hollow-newel, open-stringer staircase with scrolled tread-ends occupies the west end of the room. The Chinese lattice balustrade terminates at a small rectangular newel post with diamond-patterned strap-ornament. The handrail rises to a gooseneck ramp, which joins a second similar newel post. The stairwell is embellished by wood paneling with bands of Greek-key fretwork.

The transomed entrance to the saloon is on axis with the main entrance and displays finely carved wood trim and paneled double-leaf doors. A narrow cornice with Wall-of-Troy molding extends across the opening and is surmounted by a semi-circular transom with curvilinear tracery. A scrolled keystone motif adorns the apex of the transom. The raised-panel wainscoting which encircles the room is original. The plaster cornices and symmetrical window and door casings were added around 1824.

Saloon

The saloon is finished with early-20th-century tongue-and-groove oak flooring, original raised-panel wainscoting, architrave window and door surrounds, and elaborate plaster cornices. The late Greek Revival black marble mantel on the east wall was installed during the 1840s. The adjacent closet is original; however, the present doors were added around 1824 and then glazed around 1957.² Paneled double-leaf doors on axis with the main entrance provide access to the north porch.

East Hyphen and East Pavilion

Most of the detailing in the east hyphen and east pavilion, as well as the double-leaf doorway between them, was added around 1824 when the rooms were converted into double parlors. Both rooms display wide, finely reeded symmetrical window and door surrounds with turned corner blocks. The east hyphen

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

National Register of Historic Places

BATTERSEA

Continuation Sheet

1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

Section _7_ Page _5_

features recessed-panel wainscoting and a late Greek Revival black-and-white variegated marble mantel added during the 1840s. The east pavilion displays raised-panel wainscoting and a similarly-styled white marble mantel of the same vintage. The triple-hung window (formerly a door) on the east wall is secured with multiple interior shutters. The unfinished attic of the east pavilion is accessible only by ladder from the exterior and retains its original appearance.

West Hyphen and West Pavilion

The west hyphen is encircled by original raised-panel wainscoting and adorned by a late Federal-style wood mantel. The mantel was installed around 1824 when the room appears to have been converted into a dining room. The window openings feature architrave trim and flat jambs and soffits. Since the west pa-

vilion was originally unfinished, it may have initially functioned as a servants' hall. It was converted into a kitchen in the early-20th century. The room is finished with original raised-panel wainscoting, which was originally located in the east hyphen and pavilion and then moved in 1824. The window openings display architrave trim as well as flat jambs and soffits. The north wall contains a large wood mantel. The west wall is marked by a paneled single-leaf door with raised-panel jambs and a raised-panel soffit. The room above the west pavilion was added around 1824.

Second Floor

The second floor of the center block is divided between the stairwell, a passage, two original bedrooms on the north side of the house, and a third bedroom in the southeast corner which has been converted into a bathroom. Detailing is minimal, and the rooms feature architrave trim around window and door openings. Of these rooms, the northeast bedroom is the most elaborate and intact. It features an original wood mantel centered on the east wall, which is fully clad with original wood paneling. The bedroom on the southeast corner was converted into a bathroom around 1957.

ARCHITECTURAL ANALYSIS

The following analysis is based upon a comprehensive architectural study of Battersea prepared by Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger for the Friends of Battersea Committee of Historic Petersburg Foundation, Inc. in 1988. Battersea's current appearance is the result of numerous alterations which began to be made even while the house was still under construction in 1768. The most significant changes were made by two subsequent owners between 1824 and 1847, when the house largely assumed its present appearance. Following the Civil War, owners of Battersea recognized the historic value of the house and refrained from making stylistic changes. Instead, they focused on making repairs and introducing modern services such as gas lighting, electricity, plumbing, and central steam heat. The various interior and exterior modifications can be divided into five periods generally corresponding to successive owners of the property:

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 7 Page 6

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

Period I (1768); Period II (c. 1781-1805); Period III (1824); Period IV (c. 1841-1847); Period V (late-19th century-20th century). Since no documentation survives regarding original room uses or names, the following proposed uses and names were determined by Willie Graham and Mark Wenger based upon similar room types in Virginia and English houses of the period.

Period I (1768)

Period I comprises the time of original construction in 1768. The exact year was determined by dendrochronology testing conducted between 1992 and 1993.³ The original appearance of the house was more conventionally Georgian than it appears today. It featured Flemish-bond brick walls and was covered by a wood shingle roof painted gray to resemble slate. The windows were glazed with crown glass. Porticos marked the entrances on the front, sides, and possibly the back of the house. The original south portico was one story in height and perhaps one bay wide, similar to the original portico of Brandon.

During the initial construction, the central block was apparently envisioned as a single large space. However, after construction had progressed up to the level of the first floor, the decision was made to divide the

space by inserting an entry into the southern end of the block. This required moving the saloon fireplace several feet to the north to re-center it on the wall. Evidence of this change still exists in the basement. The entry, or “passage” as it may have been called, probably functioned in much the same way as passages in conventional Georgian houses, as a room of entry and waiting. The large central room adjoining the entry has been named the saloon. It may have functioned as an informal family living area.

The east hyphen and east pavilion appear to have been the most formal rooms in the house, comprising a parlor or drawing room, and beyond it, a dining room. The doorway between these rooms was originally in line with the entry, providing a dramatic axial vista along the entire length of the house.

The west hyphen and pavilion appear to have functioned as service and private areas. The west pavilion appears to have been left without architectural finishes, except for flooring, suggesting that this was a servants’ hall or work area. In the west hyphen, a partition wall was inserted along the southern side, creating a narrow passageway and a room which may have served as a downstairs bedchamber. Under the house, there was a single cellar under the central block.

Period II (c. 1781–1805)

The first major change at Battersea involved replacing the original 1-story south portico with a much larger 2-story portico which extended nearly the full width of the central block. The size of this portico is still discernible from a patch in the cornice. To provide access to the upper level, the center second-story window was converted into a door. The double portico was apparently flat and did not have a pediment. An examination of the roof framing shows no structural evidence of ever having been connected to a pediment.⁴ Below the house, the crawl spaces beneath the east hyphen, east pavilion, and west pavilion

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places

Continuation Sheet

Section 7 Page 7

BATTERSEA

1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

were excavated as cellars to create additional service spaces. This corresponded to a trend in England and America during the late-18th and early-19th centuries in which servants' work areas were located at the basement level and the visibility of servants was increasingly limited.⁵

Period III

In 1823 or 1824, John Fitzhugh May purchased Battersea from the estate of John Banister and William Haxall. He immediately proceeded to make sweeping changes to the house. On the south façade, the original pavilion windows were enlarged for the installation of the present Palladian windows. In addition, the original two windows on each hyphen were bricked in and the existing tripartite windows were created. The sills of these and all other first-story windows were lowered about three brick courses, necessitating the replacement of the exterior window surrounds with the existing symmetrical casings. Except for the east pavilion attic, all of the windows on the first and second stories were replaced with new sash. It was also during this time that three original windows on the east and west elevations of the house were bricked in and secured with fixed shutters.

Most of the exterior doors were altered as well. The south entrance was enlarged to receive the existing sidelights and fanlight transom. The north entrance was altered for the installation of the present 8-light transom. The entrance on the east side of the house was converted into a triple-hung window, and the door

from this entrance was moved and installed in the west entrance. Finally, the doorway to the upper level of the double portico was outfitted with new glazed doors.

May also rebuilt all four porticos on the house, adding to each a new flight of stone steps. The 2-story south portico was dismantled, and the existing 1-story Doric portico was built in its place. On the east and west ends of the house, the original porticos were replaced by the existing Doric porticos. The north portico was also rebuilt, perhaps reusing earlier columns.

On the interior, May converted the two rooms on the east end of the house into a double parlor. The original doorway between the rooms, which had been on axis with those connecting the other rooms, was bricked in, and a larger more centrally positioned doorway was created. These rooms were also updated with new woodwork and plaster cornices. The windows and doors were framed with the existing symmetrical surrounds, and the existing paneled wainscoting was installed in both rooms.

Only modest alterations were made to the entry and saloon, which retained their original wainscoting. Plaster cornices were added to both rooms, and the existing double-leaf doors were installed in the transomed doorway between the rooms.

In the west hyphen, the partition dividing what had been a chamber and small passage was removed, creating one large room, possibly used as a new dining room. A late Federal-style mantel was installed, and the wainscoting and trim were revised to accommodate the new larger sizes of the window openings. The space under the west hyphen was also excavated as a cellar.

Changes in the west pavilion were more extensive. As mentioned earlier, the west pavilion originally had no interior finishes – not even plaster. During this period, some of the original woodwork from the re-

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

National Register of Historic Places

Continuation Sheet

Section 7 Page 8

BATTERSEA

1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

decorated east rooms was installed in the west pavilion. Recycled woodwork was also incorporated into the large mantel on the north wall. Once the woodwork was in place, the room was plastered for the first time. In addition, the ceiling joists of the room were lowered to create a usable second-floor space above. The new space was subdivided into a stair landing, closet, and large heated room reusing original woodwork, flooring, and doors from other parts of the house. To provide more light in the larger room May enlarged the existing attic windows on the west side of the pavilion and added a new window on the north side.

Period IV (c. 1841–1847)

In 1841, John May sold Battersea to John and Catherine Waring who lived there for the next six years. Waring made a number of changes which greatly altered the appearance of the house. On the exterior, he added the stucco cladding and rebuilt the roof and entablature of the south portico. On the interior, he added the late Greek Revival-style marble mantels in the saloon, east hyphen, and east pavilion.

Period V (Late-19th Century–2005)

This period follows Battersea's period of significance (1768-1847) and encompasses all of the subsequent periods in the Graham-Wenger study as well as all of the subsequent owners until 2005. Battersea fell into disrepair during the Civil War and was acquired in 1870 by Franklin Wright. Wright made repairs to the

house and added modern conveniences such as gas lights and coal fireplaces. His most significant change was the addition of a small bathroom on the east end of the house around 1890. Later owners likewise refrained from making major changes and focused on making repairs and introducing modern services. Between 1905 and 1947 electricity and central steam heat were introduced, and the west pavilion was converted into a kitchen. New hardwood flooring was also installed in the saloon at this time. Around 1957, the southeast bedchamber was converted into a bathroom and a new standing-seam metal roof was installed. Battersea was conveyed to the City of Petersburg in 1985 by John D. McLaughlin, Jr. and his wife Carolyn C. McLaughlin. The City currently owns the property and plans to restore the house.

OUTBUILDINGS (and Other Resources)

1. Kitchen-Laundry-Servants' Quarter (contributing)

A 1-story, 2-room building believed to have functioned as a kitchen, laundry, and servants' quarter stands to the north of the house. The west room would have served as the kitchen; the east room as the laundry; and the attic as the servants' quarter. Built sometime during the late-18th- or early-19th century, the building features a solid random-rubble stone foundation and wood frame construction with weatherboard cladding. The upper part of the building is marked by a side-gable roof with standing-seam metal cladding and a central-interior brick chimney.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 7 Page 9

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

2. Greenhouse (contributing)

A small brick greenhouse is located southwest of the house. Built between 1823 and 1841, the building is one story in height and one bay wide and deep. It was constructed of brick laid in 3-course American bond. Originally, the south façade consisted almost entirely of fenestration, but has now been covered. A large door opening was cut into the east elevation when the building was converted into a garage during the early-20th century. The front-gable roof is clad with standing-seam metal and features gable-end parapets. A 2-light lunette window is located directly above the door opening on the east side.

3. Stable Site (contributing site)

The 1904 plat for the site shows a road that extends off of the main drive to the west and leads to a building labeled "stable," located just west of the 1784 Petersburg city line.⁶ This is likely a building described in an account of the property made around 1898 as being "almost in ruins, though the present proprietor, Mr. Wright, a Pennsylvanian by birth, has made many repairs."⁷ The stable appears to have disappeared sometime between 1934, when it appeared on a plat map for the property, and 1988, when it was described as no longer standing.⁸

4. Garage/Storage Building (noncontributing)

A 2-story wood-frame garage/storage building is located immediately to the west of the house. It was built in the early 1980s by John McLaughlin.⁹ It features vertical-board and weatherboard siding; the gable roof is clad with standing-seam metal.

5. Concrete Utility Sheds (2 noncontributing)

Two small concrete utility sheds which appear to date from the 20th century are located north of the house. These are one story in height and one bay wide. Each is accessed by a single-leaf vertical-board wood door. The buildings were constructed to somewhat resemble privies but were likely used for storage.

6. Guinea House Ruin (noncontributing site)

To the west of the garage are the ruins of a brick building that may have been a guinea house. Only part of one wall is now visible. The Graham-Wenger study suggested that it was built in the early 20th century.¹⁰

7. Southwest Tenant House (noncontributing)

In the late-19th century, Franklin Wright built a small wood-frame ell-plan tenant house southwest of the main house. The building faces east and appears to have served the same function throughout the 20th century. One-story in height, the house rests upon a brick pier foundation with concrete block infill. The house is clad with weatherboards and is covered by a gabled and hipped standing-seam metal roof. The porch features turned-post supports. At some time prior to 1934, the land the house is on was partitioned

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

National Register of Historic Places

Continuation Sheet

Section 7 Page 10

BATTERSEA

1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

off from the main Battersea estate as a separate 4.5-acre parcel. The property was conveyed to the City of Petersburg by a 1985 deed of gift from John and Carolyn McLaughlin and is still owned by the City. The address of the house was listed on the 1985 deed as 1305 Upper Appomattox Street. The house appears to have been vacant for many years and is deteriorating.

8. Truck Garage (noncontributing)

A group of utilitarian buildings near the southwest tenant house was related to the construction business of Dennie Perkinson – owner of Battersea from 1925 until 1947. A 20th-century truck garage is located immediately southwest of the southwest tenant house. It was used to store and work on large trucks. The garage is 4-bays wide and features a small concrete-block addition on the north side. The building is constructed of earth-fast telephone poles covered with corrugated sheet metal and features a side-gable, standing-seam metal roof.

9. Railroad Storage Building (noncontributing)

Immediately to the west of the garage is a small early-20th-century building that was moved in by the Perkinsons and used for storage. It was originally a railroad storage building. The one-room building is one-story in height and features wood-frame construction with weatherboard siding. The side-gable roof is covered with asbestos shingles. The building has reached an advanced state of deterioration.

10. Collapsed Building Behind Railroad Storage Building (noncontributing site)

The 1988 Graham-Wenger report listed a collapsed building that was located behind the Railroad Storage Building. It was described as being built in the 20th century and being wood-frame with several windows. All that remains of the building today is the raised concrete foundation.

11. Electric Power Substation (noncontributing structure)

An electric power substation is located on the south part of the property near Upper Appomattox Street.

12. Fenced Area (noncontributing structure)

A small square fenced area is located west of the electric power substation. This may have enclosed an earlier substation. It no longer appears to be in use, and there appears to be a small concrete slab inside.

13. Formal Garden Site (contributing site)

A raised terrace for a garden is evident in the yard to the south of the house. Historical documentation suggests that John Banister laid out and maintained a formal garden at Battersea.

Lost Outbuildings Indicated on Historic Maps

More outbuildings appear to have been located on the property. The 1877 W.F. Beers map of Petersburg indicates that there was a building immediately west of the house and one to the northeast. Three small

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 7 Page 11

BATTERSEA

1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

buildings are shown standing at the current location of the kitchen; however, none of them appear to be large enough to be the kitchen.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 7 Page 12

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

ARCHAEOLOGICAL DESCRIPTION

18th and 19th-Century Appearance of the Battersea Property

Little documentation exists for the appearance of the grounds at Battersea in the 18th century. However as the estate was being divided and sold by Col. Banister's son Theodorick Banister, several deeds were drawn which all included the term "parterres" in the legal description of the property. In the 1815 deed to William Haxall, for example, the property was declared to include "all yards, gardens, orchards, meadows, parterres, woods, underwoods, ways, waters, watercourses, tenements, hereditaments and appurtenances." Such terms as "gardens" and "appurtenances" commonly appear in legal descriptions and cannot be regarded as proving the existence of these elements on a given piece of property. However, the term "parterres" is quite unusual and may indicate that John Banister laid out and maintained a formal garden at Battersea.¹¹

The earliest graphic representation of landscape features is an 1860 plat.¹² This map shows a single drive approaching the house from the south. The drive divides and encircles an area labeled "Garden." It then extends north of the house, defining an area on that side labeled "yard." This plat probably represents the site as it was modified by John May and later described by Frederick Horner in 1898:

Battersea is reached by a short walk a mile and a half west of the city of Petersburg, via one of the principal streets and along the canal, ornamented by elegant shade trees and presenting in a distance a fine, picturesque country. The fields are devoted to horticultural purposes. In the midst of superb forest trees and others of tropical origin, magnolia, laurel, and box, and well-tended shrubbery, stands the ancient manor-house.

The walls are constructed of English brick. On either side of a spacious hall are two stairways, handsome suites of rooms suitable for parlors, salons, and chambers, with porticos in the rear overlooking magnificent grounds shaped into terrace, glen, and flower-gardens, and bathed by the lazy-flowing Appomattox River. One of the late owners of the princely estate, Judge May¹³ had felled many of the shade-trees in the front lawn, and had the grounds laid out in a garden.

Although the details of Horner's description are not entirely accurate, his observations indicate that John May heavily redesigned the gardens as well as the house.¹⁴ Furthermore, it was probably John May who built the existing greenhouse during the early-19th century.¹⁵

Today, the raised terrace for the garden is clearly evident in the large yard to the south of the house. The terrace is marked by a centrally-located set of steps, which were probably constructed by Franklin Wright in the 1890s or by Dennie Perkinson in the early-20th century. The land to the east of the house has been cleared, but the areas west and north are wooded and overgrown. The Appomattox River is not visible from the site. The only outbuildings currently existing near the house are the greenhouse, the kitchen-laundry-servants' quarter to the north, two noncontributing concrete sheds also to the north, a noncontributing garage/storage building to the west, and the ruin of a guinea house further west. A group of 20th-century sheds is located near the former southwest tenant house. They were used as part of Dennie Perkinson's construction business. An electric power substation and a fenced area, which may have been a former substation, are located on the south end of the property near Upper Appomattox Street.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

BATTERSEA

1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

Section 7 Page 13

1989 and 1992-93 Archaeological Studies by William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research

Two archaeological studies by the William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research have been conducted on the property: the first in 1989 by Robert R. Hunter, Jr. and Thomas F. Higgins III, and the second in 1992-93 by Donald W. Linebaugh, Dennis B. Blanton, and Thomas F. Higgins III. The findings of the two studies indicated the existence of a Woodland Period (1200 B.C. – 1600 A.D.) procurement camp, or lithic workshop, at or near the house as revealed by the discovery of quartz and quartzite flakes and chipping debris. The findings also indicated that during the period of habitation by the Banister, May, and Waring families between 1768 and 1847 (1) Battersea underwent numerous episodes of repair and remodeling, and (2) the western yard near the west pavilion functioned as a service yard, as demonstrated by the excavation of domestic refuse containing 18th- and 19th-century ceramic and glass fragments.

The 1989 Study

The 1989 William and Mary archaeological study comprised the first phase of archaeological investigations at Battersea. The purpose of the study was to identify and evaluate archaeological resources immediately adjacent to the north side of the west pavilion and the northeast corner of the east pavilion prior to stabilization efforts on these areas of the house. Fieldwork began on July 18 and was completed July 27, 1989. Cultural layers were recovered containing both prehistoric and 18th-, 19th-, and 20th-century domestic and architectural sheet refuse deposits. The two excavation areas located at the east and west ends of the house were divided into eight excavation units ranging from 5 by 3 feet to 8 by 5 feet in size. These units were designated by letters A through H and encompassed an area of approximately 282 square feet. Cultural layers and features identified within each unit were assigned consecutive context numbers. These deposits were recorded by detailed plan and section drawings, as well as black and white photographs and color slides.¹⁶ The depth of excavation was approximately two feet. Field notes, artifacts, drawings, photographs, and other documentary resources remain on file with the College of William and Mary Archaeological Project Center, Williamsburg, Virginia.

The excavations revealed that the lands encompassed by the Battersea estate were occupied by prehistoric groups hundreds, if not thousands, of years prior to its development as a farm. The archaeological data suggest that the prehistoric component on the site represents a procurement camp, or lithic workshop. Unlike procurement sites where cooking and food processing took place, activities here focused primarily on tool manufacture, as evidenced by the absence of pottery and hearth features. Primary lithic reduction from cores, as well as tool retouching, occurred. This is suggested by the presence of over 150 fragments of worked lithic material, including numerous quartz and quartzite decortication flakes and chipping debris. The site appears to represent specialized procurement activities carried out by groups during the Woodland Period (1200 B.C. – 1600 A.D.).¹⁷

The excavations also produced significant architectural and domestic findings from the colonial and post-colonial periods, encompassing the occupation of the site by the Banister, May, and Waring families be-

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

BATTERSEA

1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

Section 7 Page 14

tween 1768 and 1847. Architectural findings included the discovery of builder's trenches, screws, bolts, hinges, window glass, mortar, brick fragments, a fragment of roof slate, and a mix of hand-wrought, cut, and wire nails. This evidence confirms that Battersea underwent numerous episodes of repair and remodeling during this period. Analysis of sheet refuse deposits has indicated the economic status of the Banister household, reflected by its use of top-of-the-line tableware and teawares such as Chinese porcelain. This is further emphasized by the presence of a variety of vessels of different ceramic type, possibly indicating replacement sets or the expansion of their tableware equipage. The May and Waring households, while not at the same economic level as the Banister, maintained a collection of tableware sets also impressive for their given periods. However, the presence of limited ceramic types and minimum vessel counts suggest that these sets may have been considerably smaller. The May and Waring periods are characterized by the absence of Chinese porcelain and the increased presence of utilitarian wares.¹⁸

The vast majority of table and tea wares were recovered from areas adjacent to the west pavilion, indicating that broken table and tea wares were disposed of in the western yard. This pattern was slightly altered by the May and Waring households to include the eastern yard adjacent to the east pavilion. According to Thomas Higgins III, project archaeologist for the study, it was common practice during the 18th and early-19th centuries to completely shatter any ceramic dish, plate, or pot that had been damaged in some way and scatter those pieces over the service yard.¹⁹ "Areas of high activity within a yard, frequently resulting in muddy ground, were often improved and made more passable by the addition of crushed and scattered refuse."²⁰ This disposal pattern continued at Battersea for 75 years and suggests that the western yard near the west pavilion functioned as a service yard.²¹

Excavation units adjacent to the west pavilion yielded 273 ceramic fragments.²² Excavation units adjacent to the east pavilion yielded 90 ceramic fragments.²³ Ceramic fragments found during the course of the entire study included 18th-century Chinese porcelain, late-18th- and early-19th-century creamware and pearlware, and 19th-century brown stoneware.²⁴ Glass artifacts included a mix of 19th- and early-20th-century bottle glass and fragments of lamp chimney glass.²⁵

The 1992-93 Study

The 1992-93 William and Mary archaeological study comprised the second phase of archaeological investigations at Battersea. The purpose of the study was to identify and evaluate archaeological resources beneath the north, east, and west porticos prior to their restoration. Fieldwork began on December 1 and was completed December 8, 1992. Archaeological testing was undertaken beneath the porticos of the east and west pavilions and the north portico of the central block of the house. The wooden floors for the three porticos were removed immediately before the beginning of the archaeological investigation as part of the architectural renovation. Two 2.5 by 2.5-foot excavation units were placed beneath each of the three porticos. These units, designated Test units 1-6 were placed immediately adjacent to the house foundation walls and brick piers supporting the existing porticos. Cultural layers were given letter designations, and features identified within each unit were assigned consecutive context numbers. Features and deposits were recorded by detailed plan and section drawings, and black and white and color photog-

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 7 Page 15

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

raphy. Field notes, artifacts, drawings, photographs, and other documentary resources are stored at the William and

Mary Center for Archaeological Research, Williamsburg, Virginia.

This study yielded results which were similar in many regards to the 1989 study. Cultural layers were recovered containing both prehistoric and 18th-, 19th-, and 20th-century domestic and architectural sheet refuse deposits. The discovery of quartz and quartzite flakes and chipping debris provided further evidence for the existence of a Woodland Period procurement camp at or near the house. Likewise, the recovery of 18th- and 19th-century ceramic and glass fragments as well as architectural fragments reflected the habitation of Battersea by the Banister, May, and Waring families (1768-1847) and successive periods of construction and reconstruction of the porticos. Architectural evidence demonstrated that the original 1-story porticos had featured relatively wide continuous brick foundations and were the same approximate size as the existing porticos. Finally, the distribution of glass and ceramic artifacts reflected patterns discovered in the previous study, providing further evidence that the west yard served as the principle location of refuse disposal during the 18th and 19th centuries.

A combined total of 1,244 artifacts were recovered, consisting of a wide range of domestic and architectural materials. The domestic assemblage, comprising 38% of the total number of artifacts, included fragments of ceramics, bottle glass, bone, pipe stems and pipe bowls, and buttons. The architectural assemblage made up 51% of the total, and included pieces of brick, nails, and window glass. The remaining 11% of the assemblage was comprised of miscellaneous or unidentified objects, including eight pieces of prehistoric quartz or quartzite debitage.²⁶

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 8 Page 16

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

8. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Battersea was built in 1768 for Colonel John Banister. Subsequent owners between 1823 and 1847 made significant alterations to the interior and exterior which largely give the house its present appearance. Later owners of Battersea made no significant architectural or stylistic changes. Therefore, the period of significance for Battersea is 1768 to 1847. Battersea is eligible at the national, state, and local levels for the National Register of Historic Places under Criteria A, B, C, and D.

- Battersea is one of the finest examples of a Late-Georgian, five-part Palladian house in the United States. The five-part house was a basic manifestation of Palladianism in both Britain and America which enjoyed considerable popularity in the Chesapeake region during the late-18th and early-19th centuries. It is part of a family of these houses which can trace their lineage to a particular British patternbook design by Robert Morris, one of the most influential British patternbook authors in the American colonies and the most important theorist of the Palladian Revival movement. Finally, Battersea's floorplan is representative of a type of planning called the "formal plan," which characterized large residences in Britain during the period of the Palladian Revival. Battersea is eligible under Criterion C in the area of architecture with a national level of significance.
- Colonel John Banister was one of Virginia's leading statesmen during the late Colonial and Revolutionary War periods and was a founding father of the United States. Banister was a member of the House of Burgesses, the General Assembly, and the Continental Congress, and was also Petersburg's first mayor. Battersea is eligible under Criterion B in the area of politics and government at the state level of significance.
- During the Revolutionary War, Banister corresponded and met with George Washington regarding military matters. In addition to lending money and selling flour and arms to the American forces, Banister supplied food, blankets, and wood. The fields at Battersea were used for stables and pasture for the Continental Army. During the British invasion of Petersburg in 1781, Battersea was occupied by the British three times. Battersea is eligible under Criterion A in the area of military at the state level of significance.
- Archaeological studies conducted near the house by the William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research have yielded Woodland Period lithic fragments which indicate the existence of a procurement camp or lithic workshop at or near the house between 1200 B.C. and 1600 A.D. The discovery of 18th-, 19th-, and 20th-century architectural and ceramic artifacts reflects the architectural history of Battersea and the lifeways of successive owners and their servants. Historic evidence suggests that the south (front) yard of the mansion was a formal garden during the 18th century and has strong potential as a site for garden archaeology. The area around the house also has strong potential to yield artifacts relating to the British occupation of the property during the Revolutionary War era. Battersea is eligible under Criterion D in the area of archaeology with a local level of significance.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section _8_ Page _17_

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

POLITICAL AND MILITARY SIGNIFICANCE

I. Reverend John Banister

Colonel John Banister was the son of Wilmette Banister and John Banister II, a prominent planter, business associate of William Byrd, and one of the original trustees of Petersburg. John Banister II was the son of Reverend John Banister (1650-1692). Rev. John Banister was a clergyman and noted botanist with an M.A. from Oxford. He was sent by Henry Compton, bishop of London, to perform clerical duties in the New World and was the first member of the Banister family to arrive in Virginia, in 1677. His clerical duties and academic pursuits brought him into frequent contact with members of Virginia's emerging gentry class. While having limited personal wealth, his scientific studies retained the sponsorship of wealthy and influential individuals such as William Byrd I. Largely through his social and financial contacts, Rev. Banister was able to successfully launch the Banister family into gentry status.²⁷ In addition to owning a property called Hatcher's Run in what is now Dinwiddie County, Banister probably owned part of the property on which his grandson developed the estate now called Battersea.²⁸ In 1692, Rev. Banister appears to have lost his life while seeking botanical specimens.²⁹

II. John Banister II

Colonel Banister's father, John Banister II, was raised by the Byrds of Westover after his father's death. There he gained experience in plantation management and made important social contacts that served him well in later years. He later moved to Prince George County. (Dinwiddie County was subsequently created in 1752 from a portion of Prince George County.)³⁰ In 1721, Banister became the collector of the upper James River district. During the 1730s, Banister emerged as a prominent individual in the area as evidenced by his position as magistrate for Prince George County and vestryman for Bristol Parish.³¹ In 1733, he accompanied William Byrd II and Major William Mayo on their expedition to lay out the cities of Richmond and Petersburg.³² Early maps show Banister as an owner of four lots in Petersburg, which was officially established as a town in 1748.³³ Sometimes he is referred to as Captain John Banister.

III. Colonel John Banister

His son, later known as Colonel John Banister (1734-1788), was educated in England. In 1753, he was admitted to the Middle Temple in London, where he studied law but was not called to the bar. After his return to Virginia, Banister married Elizabeth Munford in 1755. Following her death, he married Elizabeth "Patsy" Bland in the late 1750s or early 1760s.³⁴

After Banister returned to Virginia, he began a long career as a mill owner as well as a career in public service. He created an industrial complex of flour and saw mills on the south bank of the Appomattox River just west of Petersburg known as the Banister Mills. Ideally situated at the falls of the Appomattox River, the mills were quite profitable. They were already operating by the 1770s, because in 1775, Banister converted his saw mill for gunpowder production for the war effort. In the same complex, Banister

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 8 Page 18

BATTERSEA

1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

operated a bakery and a coopering operation.³⁵ Banister owned many slaves and probably employed craftsmen such as coopers and millers.³⁶

As Banister prospered, he gradually assumed greater political roles. After serving as sheriff of Dinwiddie County, he became a justice of the peace for Dinwiddie in 1769. In 1764, he was elected to the vestry at Blandford Church, and in 1771, he was made a warden. Banister served in the House of Burgesses for Dinwiddie County with one brief interruption from 1766 until the Revolution.³⁷

In 1768, Banister built a large and fashionable residence at his estate of Battersea just west of the town of Petersburg. At this time, Battersea was still in Dinwiddie County. The name "Battersea" may have been derived from an estate in England by the same name which introduced and sold many plants and vegetables to Virginia. This would have been fitting considering the horticultural interests of Rev. John Banister, the first owner.³⁸ Battersea was considered the "most handsome" house in the Petersburg area prior to the Revolution.³⁹ In addition to Battersea, Banister owned Hatcher's Run, which he had inherited from his father and which was located in Dinwiddie County a few miles southwest of Petersburg. Banister also owned a plantation in Prince George County called Whitehall, several lots in Petersburg, and land in Kentucky.⁴⁰ Following the death of his second wife, Elizabeth Bland Banister, John married Ann "Nancy" Blair of Williamsburg in February 1779. They had two sons, Theodorick and John.⁴¹

IV. Colonel John Banister and Battersea During the Revolution

Colonel John Banister supported the Revolutionary War effort politically, militarily, financially, and materially. During the 1750s and 1760s, he consistently supported protests against British policies and attended all five Revolutionary Conventions during 1774, 1775, and 1776. In the last convention, he voted for independence and served on the committee that prepared the Virginia Declaration of Rights and the first constitution of Virginia. He was elected to the House of Delegates for the sessions of October 1776 through January 1778 and again from May 1781 through December 1783.⁴² On November 17, 1777, the General Assembly elected Banister to the Continental Congress to succeed Benjamin Harrison, and it re-elected him on May 29, 1778. Banister attended Congress at York and at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania from March 16 to September 24, 1778, though he spent a month from mid-August until mid-September in White Plains, New York on a committee conferring with General George Washington on the reorganization of the Continental army. Banister corresponded several times with Washington regarding military matters and the growing discontent among officers. On April 21, 1778, George Washington wrote to Banister from Valley Forge:

Dear Sir: On Saturday Evening, I had the pleasure to receive your favour of the 16th. Instant.

I thank you very much, for your obliging tender of a friendly intercourse between us; and you may rest assured, that I embrace it with cheerfulness, and shall write you freely, as often as leisure will permit, of such points as appear to me material and interesting.

I am pleased to find, that you expect the proposed establishment of the Army will succeed; though it is a painful consideration, that matters of such pressing importance and obvious necessity meet with so much difficulty and delay . . . The spirit of resigning Commissions has been long at an alarming height, and increases daily. . . .⁴³

Banister signed the Articles of Confederation in Philadelphia on July 9, 1778.⁴⁴ On September 24, 1778,

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section _8_ Page _19_**

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

Banister took a leave of absence from Congress and then resigned shortly after his return to Virginia.⁴⁵

During the course of the war, Banister lent the American forces money and sold them flour and arms. He supplied local troops with blankets and food, and also arranged for the transportation of goods. During the winter of 1780-81, Banister supplied 900 wagon loads of wood cut from his land and 110 gallons of rum for the Continental troops stationed in Petersburg. In addition, he cleared trees from 50 acres of his property for army stables and pasture.⁴⁶ Banister, himself, rose through the ranks to become a lieutenant colonel in the cavalry, serving under General Lawson in 1781.⁴⁷

By the 1770s, Petersburg had become a center for the tobacco and milling industries, a major export center, and one of the chief commercial towns in Virginia.⁴⁸ Furthermore, it was a primary link in the line of communications between the northern and southern colonies.⁴⁹ Petersburg's prominence made it a prime target for British troops during the Revolution.

The Battle of Petersburg occurred on April 25, 1781. The British forces, led by Major General William Phillips, comprised 2,500 seasoned veterans as well as a considerable fleet of frigates, sloops, and flat-bottomed boats. Phillips' army also included the Queen's Rangers, commanded by Lieutenant Colonel John Simcoe, who later occupied Battersea.⁵⁰ Since there was no regular army in Virginia, the only opposition was the Virginia State Militia, which numbered approximately 1,000. The American forces were led by Brigadier General John Muhlenberg, who was in turn commanded by Major General Frederick Wilhelm Baron von Steuben. Von Steuben placed his artillery (two six-pound guns) north of the river on the high bluffs overlooking Petersburg – now Colonial Heights. The guns could fire across the river and cover his operations in Petersburg.⁵¹ Knowing the Americans were heavily outnumbered, Von Steuben had no illusions about beating or stopping the British. His strategy, instead, was to make a strong show of force to delay their progress and then retreat northward across the Appomattox River into Chesterfield County with a minimum of losses.⁵²

During the battle, the American forces managed to repulse several British assaults and resist for two hours under heavy cannonfire. Banister was able to observe the battle from the bluffs on the north side of the river where Virginia State University now stands.⁵³ When the militia began to run low on ammunition, Steuben determined that his show-of-force had reached its limits. He ordered Muhlenberg to begin a general withdrawal.⁵⁴ Meanwhile, Simcoe and the Queen's Rangers had been making a broad circle around the south and western part of the town and were not close enough to cut off the retreat. Simcoe decided to proceed farther to the north and west with the intention of finding a known ford over the river near the Banister Mills (Campbell's Ford), crossing over onto the heights (Colonial Heights), and possibly drawing off part of the American artillery fire being directed at Phillips' main line.⁵⁵ The Americans managed to retreat north across the Pocahontas Bridge to what is now Colonial Heights. The last unit to cross over took up the flooring planks of the bridge to prevent further pursuit by the British.⁵⁶

Regarding the British invasion, Banister wrote in a letter on May 16, 1781, "In consequence of this action I was obliged to abandon my house, leaving all to the mercy of the enemy."⁵⁷ British Lieutenant Colonel John Simcoe occupied Battersea and used the property as barracks for his soldiers.⁵⁸ During the course of the war, Banister was forced to abandon Battersea a total of three times when it was occupied and plundered by the British.⁵⁹

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 8 Page 20

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

In the same letter quoted above, Banister continued regarding a second occupation of Battersea:

... and [they] arrived on the night of last Thursday again in Petersburg, and I was again obliged to retreat, leaving them in the possession of all my estate. They have not as yet burned my mills, but have taken all the bread and flour, to the amount of £800 or £1000; eleven of my best negroes the first time, and now expect they will get the rest.⁶⁰

Banister also described the second occupation in an earlier letter dated May 11, 1781:

Again last Thursday morning I was obliged to quit home or fall into their hands they having entered Petersburg after a march of twenty four miles performed in the Night . . . I expect to suffer in this Second visit to Petersburg, which I fear will be a long one, a loss of the rest of my Negroes, furniture many Horses & a great Proportion of My Stock of all kinds.⁶¹

On May 20, 1781, Lord Cornwallis and his troops arrived in Petersburg to join the British army already in the city under the command of Benedict Arnold. Arnold had succeeded General Philips after Philips died from a fever on May 13th. Cornwallis's troops encamped in the western part of town within sight of Battersea.⁶² They are believed to have had their camp near what is now the intersection of High and South streets, which is currently about three blocks east of Battersea.⁶³

On August 12, 1781 John Banister wrote regarding a third occupation:

The enemy, after a skirmish near Jamestown last Friday, passed to Cobham, and from thence sent off a party, under Tarleton, for the third time to our devoted place [Petersburg]. I expect this visit will totally destroy the remains of our property. Already they have plundered me of 82 of my best negroes, including all my best tradesmen . . .⁶⁴

In the same letter, Banister lamented about the repetitive nature of the occupations of his house:

My peculiar situation at present obliges me to Hatcher's Run, my present abode, at the risk of captivity to see what has become of my family. . . . For nothing can compensate for the sufferings and alarms they daily experience. Scarce do they remain settled a week at home, before they are obliged to abandon their dwelling, and seek asylum from the bounty of others.⁶⁵

Battersea appears to have suffered damage by the British. It has been stated that, "Colonel Banister's conspicuous association with the Revolutionary cause made his residence a victim of severe British depredations in 1781."⁶⁶ Regarding the British camp as well as the general appearance of Battersea, traveler Marquis de Chastellux visited Battersea after the departure of the British and wrote in April 1782:

Mr. Victor, who was still my guide, took me to the camp formerly occupied by the enemy. He expressed regret that I could not get a closer view of Mr. Banister's handsome country house, which I could see from where we were. There being no other obstacle however than the distance, about half a league, and the noonday heat, we determined that this should not stop us; and, walking slowly, we easily reached this house, which is really worth seeing, as it is decorated in more Italian, than English or American taste, having three porticoes at the three principal entrances, each of them supported by four columns. It was occupied by an inhabitant of Carolina called Nelson. War had driven him from his country, and war had caught up with him at Petersburg. He invited me to walk in, and while he was having me drink a glass of wine, according to custom, another Carolinian, of the name of Mr. Bull, happened in to dine with him.⁶⁷

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 8 Page 21**

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

Despite significant financial losses during the Revolution, Banister still managed to emerge afterwards as one of Petersburg's wealthiest citizens and continued to hold public office. In 1782, the General Assembly elected Banister to the Council of State, but he attended only a few meetings before resigning in early November.⁶⁸ In 1784, he served as the first mayor of Petersburg under its new charter.⁶⁹ When Petersburg was incorporated as a town in 1784, the western boundary was extended just far enough into Dinwiddie County to include the house at Battersea, apparently allowing its resident to participate in local elections.⁷⁰ According to Russell Perkinson, owner of Battersea from 1947 until 1970, Battersea "was included within the enlarged limits of the town in order that John Banister, builder and owner of Battersea, might be made mayor of Petersburg."⁷¹ The part of the Battersea estate west of the city line remained part of Dinwiddie County. During this period, a massive two-level portico was built on the front of the house, covering most of the center block.

On September 30, 1788, Banister died of an unknown illness at Hatcher's Run, where he was buried.⁷² Banister was survived by six children at the time of his death. His wife, Anne, left Petersburg at this time, and his eldest son, John, did not act on the purchase option on Battersea provided in his father's will. The estate was not completely settled until 1828 when John F. May, then owner of the house, cleared up the last details with two of Banister's sons.⁷³

V. John Fitzhugh May

In 1823 or 1824, John Fitzhugh May purchased Battersea from the estate of John Banister and William Haxall. Like his predecessors at Battersea, John May was a man of social, economic, and political prominence in the state. He was a member of the General Assembly, a judge of the Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals, and a local vestryman. In 1824 he made major alterations to the house, including replacing all four porticos, installing a new main entrance with sidelights and a fanlight, adding Palladian windows on the pavilions, and replacing all window sash. On the interior, he converted the east hyphen and pavilion into double parlors and replaced all of the woodwork in these rooms. The old woodwork was installed in the west pavilion, which was given a new second-floor space. Ornate plaster cornices were added to the formal rooms, and a Federal-style mantel was installed in the west hyphen. The doorway on the east hyphen was converted into a triple-hung window, and the door was moved to the west pavilion.⁷⁴

VI. John and Catherine Waring

John and Catherine Waring purchased Battersea from John May in 1841. Unlike previous generations whose ownership of Battersea was dependent upon great wealth, John Waring indebted himself and depended upon profits from the estate to pay the mortgage. Their ownership of the property was relatively brief because of financial troubles and the death of John in 1847. Nonetheless, during their six years at Battersea, they made significant alterations to the house including adding stucco cladding to the exterior and late Greek Revival-style marble mantels to the saloon, east hyphen, and east pavilion. At the time of John Waring's death, the mortgage had not been fully repaid, and Battersea was sold at public auction in November 1847 to Peter Boisseau and his wife Marianne Boisseau.⁷⁵

VII. The Civil War

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 8 Page 22

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

During the Civil War, Battersea suffered from neglect. Near the end of the War many of the Confederate troops, including Robert E. Lee, retreated over a bridge called the Battersea Pontoon Bridge that used to cross the Appomattox River in the area of the Battersea Mill.⁷⁶

VIII. Franklin Wright

In 1870, Battersea was purchased by Franklin Wright, a farmer from Pennsylvania. Sensitive to its historic value, he made no major alterations to the house and focused primarily on making necessary repairs rather than rebuilding. He updated the house with gas lights and coal fireplaces. Around 1890, he added a bathroom to the east end of the house.⁷⁷

During the second half of the 19th century, the area surrounding Battersea was transformed as well. Railroad lines were laid to the north, west, and south of the Battersea estate, physically separating Battersea from surrounding areas. The land to the east had been platted as early as 1830, but only had a scattering of houses and manufacturing plants by the Civil War. During the late-19th and early-20th centuries, the area developed into a densely-built residential neighborhood which is now the North Battersea/Pride's Field National Register Historic District.

IX. Dennie Perkinson and M.A. Finn; Mr. and Mrs. Russell Perkinson

In 1905, the Wright family sold Battersea to the trading partnership of Perkinson and Finn. Dennie Perkinson occupied the house for over 40 years and bought out Finn's interest in the property in 1925. Perkinson had a construction business. He introduced electricity and central steam heat to the house and installed the hardwood flooring in the saloon. In 1932, the City of Petersburg annexed a large tract of land to the west of the original 1784 city boundary. This land had previously been part of Dinwiddie County and included the western portion of the Battersea property. After the death of Dennie Perkinson in 1947, the house passed to his son, Russell Perkinson. Around 1957, Russell and Virginia Perkinson converted the southeast bedroom into a bathroom, remodeled the kitchen, and added a new standing-seam metal roof.⁷⁸ When Russell Perkinson died in 1975, Battersea passed by will to his wife, Virginia.

X. John D. McLaughlin, Jr.; The City of Petersburg

In April 1980, Battersea passed by the will of Virginia Perkinson to John D. McLaughlin, Jr. During the next five years, McLaughlin undertook various repairs with the ultimate goal of completely restoring the house as had been Virginia Perkinson's desire.⁷⁹ In August 1985, John D. McLaughlin, Jr. and his wife Carolyn C. McLaughlin conveyed Battersea to the City of Petersburg for a sum of ten dollars. At the same time, they conveyed the two tenant house properties to the City by a deed of gift.

ARCHITECTURAL SIGNIFICANCE

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 8 Page 23

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

Architecturally, Battersea is significant for three reasons. First, it is one of the finest examples of a Late-Georgian, five-part Palladian house in the United States. The five-part house was a basic manifestation of Palladianism in both Britain and America which enjoyed considerable popularity in the Chesapeake region during the 18th and early-19th centuries. Second, it is part of a family of these houses which can trace their lineage to a particular English patternbook design by Robert Morris, one of the most influential patternbook authors in the American colonies and the chief theorist of the British Palladian movement. The design of Battersea ultimately derives from plate no. 3 of Robert Morris's *Select Architecture*, first published in 1755. Finally, Battersea's floorplan, with aligned rooms flanking a central core, is an abbreviated version of a type of planning called the "formal plan" which characterized grand residences in England and Europe during the late-17th and early-18th centuries. The formal plan was closely associated with British Palladianism.

Battersea has a very long architectural ancestry. In tracing the lineage of Battersea's five-part design, it is necessary to begin with Palladio's villa designs in 16th century Italy, follow their influence to the Palladian Revival in England during the 18th century, and then follow their spread to the American colonies by means of patternbooks by such authors as Robert Morris. To trace the origins of Battersea's floorplan, one must go back to 18th-century England and then further back to 17th-century France.

- The first section of this study will examine Palladio's five-part villa and country house designs as represented in his treatise *The Four Books of Architecture*.
- The second section will describe the influence of Palladio's five-part villas on English manor house design during the early-17th century as represented by Raynham Hall, built c. 1630.
- The third section will examine the "formal plan" – how it developed in continental Europe and how it impacted the layout of English manor houses and palaces during the late-17th century.
- The fourth section will discuss the five-part Palladian house and the formal plan within the context of the Palladian Revival movement.
- The fifth section will examine Robert Morris – his literary contributions to the Palladian Revival, his influential patternbook *Select Architecture*, and his design for a house on plate 3.
- The sixth section of this study will deal with the five-part Palladian house in America – its popularization through English patternbooks, the manner in which these designs were Americanized and assimilated into regional building traditions, the impact of Robert Morris's *Select Architecture* in the Colonies, and the family of houses inspired by plate 3.
- The final section will conclude the discussion of Battersea's formal plan and analyze other significant aspects of its design, including the layout and function of the rooms in the central block, the design of the grand staircase in the entry, and the 19th-century Palladian-style alterations.

I. Palladio's Five-Part Villas

The symmetrical five-part façade is one of the most distinguishing characteristics of Palladio's villa de-

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 8 Page 24

BATTERSEA

1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

signs and was a basic manifestation of Palladianism in both Britain and America. This five-part arrangement is seen most clearly in his elevation drawings, which usually feature a two-story central block, one-story flanking hyphens adorned with colonnades or arcades, and finally, end pavilions with pointed roofs – either gabled or hipped. When viewed in elevation, nine out of Palladio's twenty-two villa and country house designs have five-part compositions. This can be seen in the elevation drawings for:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. the Villa Badoero (plate 31) | 6. the Villa Emo (plate 38) |
| 2. the Villa Zeno (plate 32) | 7. the Villa Sarraceno (plate 39) |
| 3. the Villa Barbaro (plate 34) | 8. the Villa Ragona (plate 40) |
| 4. the Villa Pisani (plate 35) | 9. the Villa Thieni (plate 45). |
| 5. the Villa Mocenigo (plate 37) | |

Palladio's elevation drawings create the illusion that the facades of his villas are basically flat – that all of the components of the façade line up on the same plane. When viewed in plan, however, Palladio's villas suddenly appear to undergo a radical metamorphoses. In many cases, the villa plans open up to include one or more courtyards and connecting wings which are invisible from the front. It also becomes evident that different parts of the facades lie on different planes. In the case of the Villa Barbaro, for example, the end pavilions leap forward as the fronts of long, projecting wings. The façade of the center block also projects forward but does not line up with the ends of the pavilions. What typically appear as pavilions in Palladio's elevation drawings are, in most cases, the gable ends of long, perpendicular barn wings which partially enclose a forecourt.

When viewing Palladio's villas in both plan and elevation, it becomes clear that although many of the villas have five-part facades, most of them do not have five-part plans. Indeed, the closest candidate for a five-part plan would be the Villa Emo. Nowhere in Palladio's villa plans do we find a five-part villa in which each unit is a single distinct room as at Battersea. In the first place, Palladio's villas were typically much larger, had more rooms, and contained one or more courtyards. Furthermore, we do not find Palladian villas in which all five parts were intended as residential living space. Most of Palladio's villas were intended to function as working farms and housed both domestic and farm-related activities in the same building or complex of connected buildings. Only the central block served as domestic living space; the connecting wings were devoted to service and agricultural purposes.

Palladio's villa complexes incorporated features of traditional farms of the Veneto region such as one or more large courtyards flanked by long barns. The wings of Palladio's villas were only slightly modified versions of the traditional Italian *barchessa* – a long barn with one side open to the farm courtyard, containing stalls for animals, storage space, and housing for laborers.⁸⁰ The barn wings of Palladio's villas were usually connected to the main house by covered walkways in the form of colonnaded or arcaded hyphens and typically enclosed a courtyard. The courtyard was a characteristic feature of Palladio's villas, and all but six of his villa designs had them.

When comparing Battersea to Palladio's villa drawings, we find that Battersea shares the same five-part arrangement of Palladio's villas when viewed in elevation but not when viewed in plan. For this reason, Battersea more closely resembles the elevation drawings for Palladio's villas than the villas themselves. At Battersea, the scale has been radically reduced, the façade has been flattened, and the function of the hyphens and pavilions given over to residential use. Many aspects of Battersea's design which differ

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 8 Page 25

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

from Palladio are the result of developments that occurred in British architecture after the initial introduction of Palladian influence and the five-part house in the 17th century.

II. Raynham Hall and the Five-Part Palladian House in 17th-Century England

The five-part Palladian villa underwent a number of modifications in both form and function when it was transplanted to English soil in the early-17th century. Designed and built between 1622 and 1637, Raynham Hall in Norfolk may have been one of the first houses in England designed with a five-part Palladian façade. Indeed, the house is credited with introducing the Palladian style to Norfolk.⁸¹ Raynham Hall was built for Sir Roger Townshend, a Norfolk landowner with a known interest in architecture.

The east façade of Raynham Hall bears a remarkable similarity to Palladio's Villa Barbaro. The house displays Palladio's signature central portico as well as the two end pavilions connected by hyphens. The pavilions not only display scrolled gables with pedimented tops similar to the Villa Barbaro, but they also feature circular oculus windows which clearly echo the sundials on the Villa.

However, while Raynham shares many similarities with Palladio's villa, the design has been radically Anglicized. At Raynham, the Villa Barbaro has essentially been hoisted in the air, with a ground floor and raised basement inserted below, giving the house a greater verticality. The Villa Barbaro has become, in effect, the *piano nobile* for Raynham Hall. The central block of Raynham does not project forward as on the Villa Barbaro but has been flattened against the façade. The hyphens have been shortened from five bays to two and integrated into the body of the house. The pavilions are no longer the fronts of working barns, but have become decorative embellishments which serve merely to articulate the façade. Whereas Palladio's villas often consisted of separate units grouped around one or more courtyards, Raynham reads as a single mass which has been articulated into five parts.

Sir Roger Townshend may have played a large role in the design of Raynham. While the detailed execution must have been left to Townshend's mason, William Edge, the wish to incorporate architectural elements from known works by Inigo Jones, and even perhaps directly from Palladio's villas, must have come from Townshend.⁸² Inigo Jones is credited with introducing the Palladian style to England during the first decades of the 17th century. The design of the portico at Raynham recalls one of Jones's portico designs for the Prince's Lodging at Newmarket.⁸³

Raynham Hall has a very compact plan which makes it unlike many of Palladio's villa designs, such as the one for the Villa Barbaro. This type of planning was the result of trends in English manor house design over the previous fifty years. For most of the Tudor period (1485-1603), the standard layout for both manor houses and royal residences comprised single-pile ranges around a central square courtyard. The courtyard house was ubiquitous in England for gentry, noble, and royal households. The trend towards more compact and symmetrical house designs with double-pile plans began during the latter part of the Tudor period and is best represented by Hardwick Hall (1590-97).

The design of Raynham is much closer in concept to that of Battersea not only in the compact form of the exterior, but also in the function of the interior. Like Battersea, Raynham was intended to serve solely as domestic living space and includes no spaces for stables or agricultural use.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 8 Page 26

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

We find even more similarities with Battersea when we study the plan of Raynham. Here we can see a symmetrical five-part floorplan on the east side of the house vividly reflecting the five-part articulation of the façade. If one were to divide the plan of Raynham in half so that it was single-pile in depth, one would almost have the plan of Battersea. Even though the clearly-articulated five-part plan at Raynham was new in regard to its symmetry, the rooms themselves, their sequence, and their function were steeped in English tradition. The large central room at Raynham was the great chamber. Since the late-14th century, the great chamber had served as the highest status room and ceremonial center of English manor houses, used for grand formal dining and entertaining. At Raynham, its importance was advertised by the columned portico on the exterior. To either side of the great chamber at Raynham Hall were suites of matching chambers called lodgings. Lodgings in English manor houses typically consisted of a string of rooms containing a withdrawing chamber, bedchamber, and a small room at the end used as a private study called a closet.⁸⁴

The plan of Raynham, however, is not completely symmetrical for both halves (or piles) of the house and still retains vestiges of medieval planning such as the laterally-positioned great hall. Raynham, therefore, represents a transitional stage towards increasing symmetry. Later in the 17th century, double-pile houses would be developed in which *both* sides of the house (both piles) displayed mirror-image five-part plans. The double-pile, five-part plan became an increasingly common feature of English manor houses during the late-17th and early-18th centuries.

III. The Formal Plan

Battersea has a unique type of floorplan which mirrored on a smaller scale the layout of large houses and palaces in England and Europe during the late-17th and early-18th centuries. This type of layout is referred to as the “formal plan.” This section will analyze the development of the formal plan – how it evolved in continental Europe and how it impacted the layout of English manor houses during the late-17th century.

Battersea displays a symmetrical five-part floorplan with the central block divided into two rooms: the “entry” and a larger room called the “saloon,” after similar rooms in English and American houses of the period. The saloon is accessed from the entry and on the north side by double-leaf doors in line with the main entrance, creating an axis through the center of the house. The flanking rooms are arranged in a linear fashion with the doors aligned *en filade* on a cross-axis along the southern side of the house. The linear progression of rooms and the resulting axial vista from one end of the house to the other recalls in a modest way the planning of the great formal houses and palaces in Britain and on the Continent during the late-17th and early-18th centuries.⁸⁵ This manner of planning, called the “formal plan,” came to England from France and dominated English domestic design practice during the early-18th century.

The widespread use of the formal plan in England can be traced to developments in architecture following the restoration of the Stuart monarchy in 1660. During the English Civil War, many gentry and nobility fled to the Continent either to avoid the war at home or to follow Charles II into exile. After the Restoration those who were still abroad came flocking back. During their travels they had seen how houses were developing in France and the rest of Europe, and upon their return they brought with them a wave of French influence. The formal plan was found on the Continent on every kind of scale, in France, Ger-

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 8 Page 27

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

many, Spain and the Low Countries as well as in Italy, where it had ultimately originated.⁸⁶

Perhaps the most magnificent example of the continental formal plan is the Chateau of Vaux-le-Vicomte (1657-1661), designed by Le Vau and built for Nicholas Fouquet, finance minister of Louis XIV. It was built during the last years of Charles II's exile, between 1657 and 1661. The garden façade presents a five-part plan with the central block divided into two rooms: a *vestibule* and the *grand salon*. In large French houses, the *grand salon* was the room of state which functioned as the ceremonial center of the house and was used for grand formal dining. To either side were suites of chambers arranged *en filade* in the traditional French sequence of *antechambre*, *chambre*, and *cabinet* – the whole known as an *appartement*. This sequence approximated the English one of withdrawing chamber, bedchamber, and closet.⁸⁷ On the exterior of French houses, the high status of the *grand salon* was usually expressed with a frontispiece or portico on the center block. In the case of Vaux-le-Vicomte, the *salon* is marked by a double portico. The *chambre* and *cabinet* were usually expressed on the exterior as terminal pavilions.⁸⁸

The *salon*, or *grand salon*, was the focal point of the formal plan. It was the large room at the center from which the suites of smaller rooms radiated. As a room type, the *grand salon* came to France from Italy, where it was known as a *grande salone*. The word *salon* was the French translation of the Italian *salone*.⁸⁹ While the French sequence of *antechambre*, *chambre*, and *cabinet* approximated the English sequence of withdrawing chamber, bedchamber, and closet, there were some important differences. The French system was much more public in nature. In France, the *chambre* of a great person was a bed-sitting room used for the reception of visitors and for private meals as well as for sleeping. The *antechambre* was, as its name implies, essentially a waiting room for visitors hoping to get access to the *chambre*. Sometimes the occupant of the *chambre* would come out into the *antechambre*, so that people not considered important enough to be admitted into the *chambre* could pay their respect or present petitions. The *cabinet* was the most important room in the French *appartement*. It was the private room. To get into the *cabinet* of a monarch or great man one had to be in the inner ring of power. *Cabinets* were usually small but very richly decorated rooms which often contained their owners' most precious art objects and curiosities.⁹⁰

Following the Restoration in England, the influx of returning émigrés as well as the influx of continental ideas about house design resulted in the Frenchification of English domestic planning. The formal plan with a saloon between matching suites of chambers grew in popularity until by 1700 it had become more or less obligatory for anyone wanting to be in fashion.⁹¹ This injection of French influence had the result of changing room names. The central room gradually ceased to be called a great chamber and was increasingly called a *salone*, *salon*, or saloon. Closets became *cabinets*. Suites of bedchambers formerly called lodgings were called apartments.⁹²

The formal plan gained such prestige and popularity in England and Europe during the late-17th and early-18th centuries, that one could almost say that it became an international style. According to Girouard:

The formal house flourished because it reflected absolute monarchy and the society that went with it. In the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, when absolute monarchy was at its most powerful, saloons between matching apartments were springing up from Russia to America, and from Sweden to Sicily. The immense prestige of Louis XIV and his court set the fashion, but it was imitated by the opponents of France as well as its allies – by Prince Eugene at the Belve-

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 8 Page 28

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

dere and the Duke of Marlborough at Blenheim.⁹³

A saloon with apartments to either side, long axial vistas leading up to the saloon or through the apartments to their inner sanctuaries, and the extension of such vistas through the surrounding gardens and countryside, became essential features of all great houses – and were imitated in miniature in smaller ones. They suggested with vivid appropriateness a hierarchy under a supreme ruler, and ordered and regulated movement within the hierarchy.⁹⁴

The formal plan became a characteristic feature of English Baroque palace design, as exemplified by Blenheim Palace (1705-1724) and Castle Howard (1699-1712).

IV. The Five-Part House and the Formal Plan During the Palladian Revival

Battersea's design as a five-part Palladian villa was a direct result of a British architectural movement known as the Palladian Revival. This section will discuss the five-part Palladian house and the formal plan within the context of the Palladian Revival movement.

The Palladian Revival was a reform movement which sought to purify British architecture of the perceived lawlessness and ornamental excesses of the preceding Baroque style. Based upon the work and writings of Italian Renaissance architect Andrea Palladio, the movement dominated English architecture for forty years – from about 1720 to 1760. The publication of the first volume of *Vitruvius Britannicus* by Scottish architect Colen Campbell in 1715 played a key role in launching the movement in England. Interest in Palladio was further sparked by the appearance of Giacomo Leoni's translation into English of Palladio's 1570 treatise, *The Four Books of Architecture*. Palladio's treatise served as a guidebook for the English for reproducing classical forms and for designing classical buildings. Palladio was emulated as the orthodox purveyor of the classical tradition. As the Palladian taste became a central aspect of English design during the early-18th century, the formal plan remained the dominant plan type for large manor houses. According to Girouard:

... Palladianism did not mean a change of plan in the country-house world, it only meant a change of uniform. The reign of the saloon between apartments went on – but now the ceremonial centre could be neatly expressed in terms of a temple, with a portico at one or both ends. As in earlier models, the result did not necessarily have to be grand, and there was scope for a variety of arrangements.⁹⁵

According to Girouard, Stratford Hall (c. 1738) in Westmoreland County, Virginia is a perfect example of a small formal house of the 1730s, comprising a saloon between matching apartments.⁹⁶

Houghton Hall, begun in 1722, has a five-part façade, a formal plan, and was one of the most important and influential houses of its time.⁹⁷ It was built for Sir Robert Walpole on his family estate at Houghton in Norfolk. The house was published in Colen Campbell's *Vitruvius Britannicus* and was designed either by Colen Campbell, James Gibbs, or possibly both.⁹⁸ Though the origins of the floorplan are in the 17th century, the design of the house is Palladian inside and out. The formal plan of the interior is perfectly expressed by the symmetrical five-part massing of the garden façade. The plan of Houghton Hall was to become a standard type in the 1740s and 1750s⁹⁹ and in some respects resembles a double-pile version of Battersea.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 8 Page 29

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

Before concluding the discussion of Battersea and the formal plan, some contemporary developments in England and America need to be addressed.

V. Robert Morris (1701-1754)

Battersea belongs to a group of houses believed to be derived from plate no. 3 in Robert Morris's *Select Architecture*. This section will examine Robert Morris – his literary contributions to the Palladian Revival movement in Britain, his influential patternbook *Select Architecture*, and his design for a house on plate 3.

Books of architectural designs known as patternbooks played a central role in both launching the Palladian Revival movement in Great Britain as well as transmitting its ideals abroad. For this reason, the Palladian Revival has always been considered a very bookish movement. The publication of Colen Campbell's *Vitruvius Britannicus* and the Leoni edition of Palladio's *Four Books of Architecture* heralded the arrival of the Neo-Palladian era in Britain and inaugurated a great period of architectural book publishing.¹⁰⁰ Within ten years a continuous stream of books had begun to flow from the presses, so that between 1725 and 1759, nearly every year saw the appearance of one or more illustrated books on architecture.¹⁰¹

Robert Morris (1701-1754) was the most important and almost the *only* contemporary theoretical writer of the Palladian Revival movement.¹⁰² Surveying is known to have been Morris's main occupation, and surveyor was his assumed title. Morris was also an amateur architect whose qualifications rested primarily upon his theoretical knowledge of architecture rather than his practical experience. Only two works can be attributed to Morris with any certainty: additions to Culverthorpe, Lincs. and a house on Burlington Street, both for Sir Michael Newton.¹⁰³

Little is actually known about Morris other than what he published. His first book, *An Essay in Defence of Ancient Architecture* (1728), was an attack on contemporary work of Vanbrugh and Hawksmoor. Six years later he published a book entitled *Lectures on Architecture, Consisting of Rules Founded upon Harmonick and Arithmetical Proportions in Buildings . . .* (1734-36). In order to give these lectures, Morris founded a group which he called the Society Established for the Improvements of Arts and Sciences. The lectures developed a system of proportions based on cubic units applicable to everything from a great villa to a chimney. It is difficult to assess the influence of the *Lectures*, but it is certain that his later books of designs, *Rural Architecture* (1750), the *Architectural Remembrancer* (1751), and, above all, *Select Architecture* (1757), were much used.¹⁰⁴

Robert Morris firmly aligned himself with the architects of the Palladian Revival, who sought to purify English architecture of the "affected and licentious" forms associated with the Baroque style. Morris and the Palladian circle of architects sought to establish a classical architecture of purity, simplicity, restraint, and discipline, as reflected in the work and writings of Andrea Palladio. Above all else, Morris sought to establish a rational architecture which followed rules. His desire for objective aesthetic standards for architecture appears to have been one of the chief motivations behind his book *Lectures on Architecture, Consisting of Rules*. Throughout the book, he continually emphasized the importance of symmetry, regu-

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section _8_ Page _30_

BATTERSEA

1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

larity, and proportions. Architecture, he believed, should reflect the principles of order inherent in Nature.

A fascination with perfect geometric forms characterized architects of the Palladian Revival in general and is reflected in the philosophy and writings of Robert Morris. For example, one of the diagrams in his book *Lectures on Architecture* illustrates how one could use cubic proportions to design a house in the shape of a cube, two cubes together, a cube-and-a-half, or various other combinations. At Battersea, the cubic shape of the central block was a direct expression of this Neo-Palladian love of geometrically pure forms.

Select Architecture was one of the most influential English patternbooks in the American colonies. First published in 1755, it was intended for the general public and for clients of architects rather than for professional builders and tradesmen.¹⁰⁵ The book was one of the few being published in England which deliberately included Palladian-style designs for relatively modest buildings. In his preface, Morris stated, “. . . most who have wrote on this subject, have raised nothing but Palaces, glaring in decoration and dress; while the Cottage, or plain little Villa, are passed by unregarded.” This was no doubt one of the reasons why *Select Architecture* enjoyed such a wide popularity in the American colonies. Morris, in essence, brought the Palladian style from the realm of the British aristocracy to colonial American merchants and planters. The book itself was modest in size and would have been inexpensive to buy.

As stated earlier, the design of Battersea was ultimately derived from plate 3 of *Select Architecture*. Morris described Plate no. 3 as:

A Building proposed to be erected on the South Downs of Sussex. – The two fronts alike, one facing the Sea, the other enclosed with a Garden, and to the Downs; it was proposed for a single Gentleman. – The Extent of the House, Court, and Offices are 160 Feet.

Morris’s design for plate 3 is a seven-part variation of the standard five-part Palladian villa. The seven-part design comprises a central block with wings which are flanked by low walled courtyards connecting to end pavilions. The pavilion on the left was intended to serve as a stable, and the adjacent courtyard as the stable yard.

Some of Morris’s design ideas apparently came from a kinsman of his named Roger Morris, who was a prominent Palladian Revival architect. According to Dr. Parissien at the University of Plymouth in Devon, England, “. . . it seems likely that plate 3 was derived by Morris from his kinsman Roger Morris’s typical villa plan – seen notably at Roger Morris’s design for Whitton Park, Middlesex.” He continues, “the central block, with its astylar elevations and octagonal cupola, are typically Roger Morris.”¹⁰⁶

Whitton Place was a five-part Palladian-style house which was built between 1736 and 1739 for the Earl of Ilay, and which was located about eight miles west of London in Middlesex. Roger Morris’s design for Whitton Place featured a cubic central block with astylar elevations marked by nearly-identical vestibules on all four sides. The central block was covered by a pyramidal roof with a small squared cupola. Flanking hyphens connected to long, perpendicular wings which housed offices and enclosed a courtyard on the north side of the house. The house was destroyed around 1847.¹⁰⁷

Even though plate 3 was probably not based directly on Whitton Place, it repeats typical Roger Morris

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 8 Page 31

BATTERSEA

1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

design elements which appear at Whitton: the astylar cubic central block, the pyramidal roof, and the cupola. For plate 3, Morris expanded the five-part façade arrangement of Whitton Place to seven and replaced the large courtyard with flanking side courts. In *Select Architecture*, Morris appears to have abolished courtyards in all other cases except for his design for plate 33, which is specifically designated as a “Farm House” with a “Farm Yard.” One might even go a step further and say that forecourts were not a feature associated with Morris-style Palladianism.

Robert Morris appears to have been familiar with the concept of the five-part Palladian house as well as the formal plan. He used both for designs in *Select Architecture*. In fact, many of his domestic designs comprise a set of variations on the five-part theme. Morris provided a five-part house for his design on plate 11 and then proceeded to expand this to seven parts in plate 3 and even to nine parts in plate 20. Morris employed the formal plan for some of his grander residential designs. Plate no. 6 is an excellent example of a double-pile, five-part formal plan. Plate no. 23 features a seven-part formal plan. Morris, though, does not appear to have used a formal plan for plate 3. There are too few rooms devoted to domestic use, and there is no lateral alignment of door openings connecting suites of rooms. Since this was intended as a modest house for a “single gentleman,” there would be no need for matching suites of apartments.

VI. The Five-Part Palladian House in America

The sixth section of this study will deal with the five-part Palladian house in America – its popularization through English patternbooks, the manner in which these designs were Americanized and assimilated into regional building traditions, the family of houses inspired by plate 3 of Morris’s *Select Architecture*, and finally, the continued popularity of the five-part Palladian house during the early-19th century.

As mentioned above, one of the primary methods for transmitting the ideas and ideals of the Palladian Revival to America was through builder’s guides and patternbooks. English architect James Gibbs’s *Book of Architecture* (1728) and Robert Morris’s *Select Architecture* (1755) were two of the most influential patternbooks in the American colonies. These books contained designs for symmetrical five-part houses which became very popular in the Chesapeake region – more popular in fact than in any other part of the eastern seaboard. In Virginia and Maryland, these five-part Palladian designs spawned generations of descendants and gradually became integrated into vernacular building traditions. It is even possible to distinguish two distinct families of five-part houses which were inspired by the patternbook drawings of James Gibbs and of Robert Morris.

Generally, these five-part houses displayed symmetrical facades, with a two- or three-story central block, flanking hyphens, and terminal pavilions or dependencies. Those inspired by the designs of Gibbs tended to be massive in scale, featuring flanking dependencies which were connected or not to the main house by curved arcades and enclosed a forecourt. Virginia houses inspired by Gibbs included Blandfield (c. 1769-72) in Essex County, Mannsfield (c. 1770) in Spotsylvania County, and Mount Airy (1748-1758) in Richmond County. Morris-inspired houses tended to be linear and elongated with flat facades and no forecourt.

At this point, it should be noted that even though a number of colonial houses were directly inspired by patternbook designs, for the most part this was not the case. “Although some 18th-century planters and

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 8 Page 32

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

merchants owned a handful of costly English, French, and Italian architectural books, handsomely bound and generously illustrated with fine line engravings, few mined these treatises as guides for building.”¹⁰⁸ Patrons and builders “plumbed these works for showpiece features such as staircases, mantels, and frontispieces rather than for overall plans of buildings.”¹⁰⁹ In most cases, the Virginia gentry sought to replicate buildings that were known to them. They tended to look to familiar nearby structures in the design of new buildings because they knew what they were getting and approximately how much it would cost.¹¹⁰ As is true of many traditional cultures, the Virginia gentry in most cases had no desire to depart from past forms or precedent. Therefore, architectural design in Virginia, as elsewhere, was characterized by the subtle interplay between established regional building traditions and published academic sources.¹¹¹

The degree to which Morris’s literary contributions on the whole were able to influence the mainstream of the Palladian movement in England is questionable. Regarding possible British derivatives from the similarly-designed plates 3, 16, and 33, Professor Parissien of the University of Plymouth wrote in 2005 that he does not know of any exact replicas.¹¹² It appears, instead, that Robert Morris had the greatest impact not in his native country but in the American colonies. Morris’s Palladianesque designs in *Select Architecture* provided inspiration for scores of American dwellings not only in Virginia and Maryland but also in North Carolina and even Georgia.¹¹³ These ranged from fairly close copies of the plates, or of other buildings derived from them, to vernacular interpretations.¹¹⁴ Morris’s substantial influence on the architecture of Thomas Jefferson is well-known and well-documented. Jefferson may have even played a role in popularizing Morris’s designs.¹¹⁵

Houses in Virginia and Maryland believed to be derived from Robert Morris’s *Select Architecture* include:

1. **Tazewell Hall**, Williamsburg, VA (1758-1762) from plate 3.
2. **Battersea**, Petersburg, VA (1768) from plate 3.
3. **Brandon**, Prince George County, VA (c. 1765) from plate 3.
4. **Belnemus**, Powhatan County, VA (c. 1765) from plate 3.¹¹⁶
5. **Whitehall**, Anne Arundel County, MA (1765) from plate 3.¹¹⁷
6. **Drawing** for a five-part house (c. 1770) Virginia Historical Society, from plate 3.¹¹⁸
7. **Randolph-Semple House**, Williamsburg, VA (c. 1781) from plate 37.¹¹⁹
8. **Belle Isle**, Lancaster County, VA (c. 1760-1780) from plate 33.¹²⁰

Morris’s design for plate 3 inspired the design of at least six houses in Virginia and Maryland: Tazewell Hall, Brandon, Battersea, Belnemus, Whitehall, and an unidentified c. 1770 drawing at the Virginia Historical Society. Plate 3 is the only Morris design for a house in *Select Architecture* which has a single-pile plan; all of the others are double- or triple-pile. Since it was basically one-room deep, Morris’s design for plate 3 lent itself well to a regional need for houses which were simple to build, well ventilated, and impressive in their length, but not so large as to be overly expensive.¹²¹ The single-pile plan would have made it a less desirable alternative for a residence in Britain, with the area’s colder climate. However, in the Chesapeake region, the increased ventilation a single-pile plan offered would have made it ideal.

In Morris’s plate 3 design, the left pavilion functions as a stable and the adjacent courtyard as the stable

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 8 Page 33

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

yard. In America, the stable would never be attached to the residence but would be in a separate building. Furthermore, in all known American derivatives, the side courts of Morris's design were replaced by actual rooms. American derivatives of plate 3 were, therefore, completely domestic in function.

1. **Tazewell Hall**, Williamsburg, VA (1758-1762)

Built between 1758 and 1762, Tazewell Hall appears to have served as a prototype for both Battersea and Brandon and is considered Virginia's first known fully developed example of Morris-style Palladianism.¹²² The house was built by an unknown architect-builder for John Randolph II, an English-trained lawyer, legislator, and colonial attorney general. Tazewell Hall was located on the southern edge of Williamsburg on South England Street and was designed with a seven-part scheme based upon Morris's plate 3. The large size of the house would have made it one of the principal buildings of Williamsburg. It was longer than the main hall of the College of William and Mary.¹²³ As originally constructed, the residence was "a quite sophisticated Virginia version of a Palladian-style villa rendered in the indigenous materials of wood frame sheathed with beaded weatherboards and covered with a shake roof."¹²⁴ Unlike Morris's plate 3, however, the center block of Tazewell Hall was not subdivided with the insertion of a stair hall, but comprised a single saloon.¹²⁵ Like many of Palladio's villas, the saloon at Tazewell extended two full stories in height and was lighted by clerestory windows.¹²⁶ The two-story height was a characteristic of the Italian *salone*, the ancestor of the French *salon* and the English saloon. Since John Banister served as a member of the House of Burgesses from 1766 until the Revolution, it is likely that he would have been familiar with this house.

2. **Brandon**, Prince George County, VA (c. 1765)

With its seven-part plan, Brandon is the best surviving example of the family of houses inspired by Morris's plate 3. Brandon was built around 1765 for Nathaniel Harrison II in Prince George County. "Brandon's close adherence to Morris's plate 3 design testifies to the eminent suitability of Morris's Palladian inspired schemes for the life-style of Colonial Virginians."¹²⁷ Brandon and Battersea shared a number of design similarities such as the division of the central block into a stair hall and saloon as well as the Chinese lattice staircases. At Brandon, the partition wall between the stair hall and saloon was removed during an early-19th-century remodeling.

3. **Battersea**, Petersburg, VA (1768)

With its five-part configuration, Battersea is an abbreviated version of the linear seven-part schemes of Tazewell Hall, Brandon, and Morris's plate 3. At the same time, however, Battersea's five-part design more closely resembles the elevation drawings of Palladio's five-part villas, suggesting a mixing of ideas from both Morris and Palladio.¹²⁸

Battersea and the family of houses inspired by Morris's plate 3 appear to have been significantly influenced by regional vernacular building traditions. One might describe these houses as a fusion of Morris-style Palladianism with regional vernacular influence. All of these houses were basically single-pile in plan, bringing them close in conception to Virginia's vernacular tradition of single-pile hall-parlor houses and I-houses. For much of the 17th century, the dominant house type found in Virginia was the hall-parlor house, comprising two adjacent rooms: a hall, used for living, and a second smaller room used variously

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 8 Page 34

BATTERSEA

1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

as a parlor or chamber. During the 1750s, a new type of house now known as the I-house began to replace the earlier form. The I-house was two stories in height and featured a central passage between the two rooms on the first and second stories. Like the hall-parlor house, the I-house was one room deep. The single-pile depth of the I-house encouraged the flow of air and was especially well-suited to the warmer American climate. Whereas the hall-parlor house belonged to an earlier post-medieval English building tradition, the I-house reflected the balance, symmetry, and rational order which characterized the Georgian style. Tazewell Hall, Brandon, and Battersea were built during the 1750s and '60s – at precisely the same time that the I-house was replacing the hall-parlor house as the dominant house type along the entire Atlantic seaboard.¹²⁹ The single-pile design of these three houses reflected the strong influence of vernacular building traditions, which favored the one-room depth. This may have determined the choice of Morris's plate 3 as a model, since it was the only house design in the book with a single-pile plan. It is also worth noting that Bollingbrook (East Hill), another prominent 18th-century Petersburg residence, also had an elongated and apparently single-pile plan. According to an 1848 woodcut, the house was one story high and seven bays wide. During the Revolution, British generals used Bollingbrook as their headquarters.

On a broader level, Battersea was representative of the many five-part Palladian houses being built in the colonies in general, especially in the Chesapeake region comprising Virginia and Maryland. The five-part house appears to have been so thoroughly integrated into Colonial Virginia's building traditions that historians have proposed that there were more than one generation of this house type. It has been suggested that the current Brandon as well as a now-lost nearby wood-frame Brandon "were surely second-generation Morris designs, influenced less by the book than by existing Virginia buildings."¹³⁰

Even after the Palladian Revival had faded from fashion in England, the afterglow lingered in the United States well into the early-19th century. Fifty years after the publication of *Select Architecture*, the five-part Palladian house remained a viable alternative for both high-style mansions as well as more modest residences. A number of the most prominent architects practicing at the turn of the 19th century included five-part Palladian houses in their design repertoire. Noted architect Benjamin Henry Latrobe designed at least two five-part houses in Richmond, Virginia: the DuVal-Wirt house (1798) and Clifton (1808-1809).

In Georgetown, William Thornton designed Tudor Place (1816). Finally, a vernacular interpretation, Castlewood (c. 1816-1835), is located in what is now the government complex of Chesterfield County, Virginia. It is interesting to observe that all of the late examples mentioned thus far follow the linear Morris-style configuration seen at Battersea. None of these follow the Gibbs model of flanking dependencies at perpendicular angles connected by curved hyphens and enclosing a forecourt. As mentioned earlier, the five-part Palladian house was most prominent in the Chesapeake region comprising Virginia and Maryland. There tended to be fewer examples in the Deep South as well as regions further north, and they tended to be later in date. The five-part Palladian house was reborn in the early-20th century with the advent of the Colonial Revival. The Williams-Massey house (4207 Sulgrave Road; 1927) by William Lawrence Bottomley in Richmond Virginia's Windsor Farms neighborhood is an early-20th-century reinterpretation of the Palladian five-part house.

Some of the better-known five-part houses built in Virginia during the 18th and 19th centuries include:

1. **Tazewell Hall** (c. 1760) Williamsburg

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 8 Page 35

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

-
2. **Mount Airy** (1748-1758) Richmond County
 3. **Brandon** (c. 1755; demolished) Prince George County (drawing on 1810 insurance policy)
 4. **Brandon** (c. 1765) Prince George County
 5. **Battersea** (1768) Petersburg
 6. **Mannsfield** (c. 1760-1770; destroyed 1862-1863) Spotsylvania County
 7. **Blandfield** (c. 1769-72) Essex County
 8. **Drawing** for a five-part house (c. 1770) Virginia Historical Society
 9. **Soldier's Joy** (1783-1785)
 10. **Mount Vernon** (1787) Fairfax County
 11. **Sketch** for a five-part house (1797) *probable architect*: Benjamin Latrobe
 12. **DuVal-Wirt House** (1798) Richmond, *architect*: Benjamin Latrobe
 13. **Belmont** (c. 1799-1802) Loudoun County
 14. **Exeter** (1790-1803) Loudoun County
 15. **Woodlawn** (1800-1805) Fairfax County, *architect*: William Thornton
 16. **Clifton** (1808-1809) Richmond, *architect*: Benjamin Latrobe
 17. **Upper Breemo** (1820) Fluvanna County, *designers*: John Hartwell Cocke, John Neilson
 18. **Castlewood** (c. 1816-1835) Chesterfield County.

VII. Battersea: Points of Significance

The above sections have focused on tracing the origins of Battersea's five-part Palladian design and formal plan. The final section will conclude the discussion of Battersea's formal plan and analyze other significant aspects of the house, including the design and function of the rooms, the grand staircase in the entry, and the 19th-century Palladian-style alterations.

The Formal Plan

It is evident that the designer of Battersea adopted the formal plan for the layout of John Banister's house. The division of the central block into entry and saloon along the central axis of the house follows the English progression of hall and saloon. The linear arrangement of rooms on either side of the central block with all of the doors aligned *en filade* mirrors the way in which matching suites of apartments in French and English houses extended at a lateral cross axis, providing dramatic axial vistas. The only difference at Battersea is that the flanking rooms, instead of being entered from the saloon, are accessed from the entry. As mentioned earlier, however, the partitioning of the saloon and entry into two separate spaces was an afterthought which occurred after construction had already begun. As originally planned, the entire central block at Battersea would have been the saloon, and the flanking rooms would have, therefore, connected directly to it. The saloon at Battersea would have held a central position in the house similar to the saloon at Tazewell Hall and at Stratford Hall.

Since building conditions in the American colonies were far different from what existed in England, and since no grand palaces or manor houses were being built, it is not surprising that examples of the formal plan were rather rare. Colonial building traditions as well as the absence of a European-style aristocracy would have discouraged its use for the relatively modest buildings of the 18th century. Battersea's plan appears to have been a combination of both Morris's plate 3, which had a well-defined central block, and

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section _8_ Page _36_

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

Tazewell Hall, which had lateral doorways arranged *en filade* along the five spaces comprising the central block and hyphens. At Tazewell, however, the alignment of doorways stopped at the terminal pavilions and did not extend all the way to the ends of the building. At Battersea, the lateral axial alignment evident at Tazewell was perfected, extending the full length of the house. Even the windows were aligned at both ends of this axis.

Considering the warm climate, adopting the formal plan for a house in Virginia made perfect sense. All of the aligned doorways created a breezeway through the length of the house. The layout of rooms along two intersecting axes as well as the single-pile depth made it possible to catch breezes from four directions instead of just two. In France, the custom of arranging rooms *en filade* had come from Italy as part of the architectural grammar of the formal house and Renaissance classical influence. Most of Palladio's villas had suites of rooms with doorways on axis. However in northern Europe, this practice became something of a liability because the aligned doorways tended to encourage cold drafts. Regarding the architectural tastes of her husband, Louis XIV, Madame de Maintenon once said, "With him only grandeur, magnificence, symmetry matter; it is infinitely worthwhile enduring all drafts which sweep under the doors if only these can be arranged facing each other."¹³¹ In other words, one had to sacrifice comfort for display. In Virginia with its warmer climate, this liability became an asset.

To conclude the discussion of Battersea's formal plan, it should be noted that while Battersea preserved the form and physical layout of the formal plan in miniature, the function of its parts was thoroughly Americanized. Because of the small size of the house, the function of the rooms had to be changed. The wings of the house did not contain matching suites of chambers. Instead, the west pavilion was a servants' work area. The east pavilion is believed to have originally served as a dining room. Battersea was built at the same time that the formal plan was beginning to wane in England. During the mid-18th century, the dining room began to replace the saloon as the preferred room for formal dining in England. Evidence of this trend appeared as early as 1731 at Houghton Hall. According to Mark Girouard, "Once the saloon had ceased to be used for formal meals its position as the ceremonial pivot of the house had gone – and the reasons for putting it in the centre of the house with a great portico in front of it had gone also."¹³²

The Entry and Staircase

The subdivision of Battersea's central block into an entry and saloon brought the design of the house more closely in accordance with Morris's plate 3. At the William Finnie house in Williamsburg, a similar subdivision of the large central space was made some years after its completion.¹³³ At Battersea the entry probably functioned much the same way that the passage did in other Georgian houses of the time: as a room of entry and waiting for servants and guests, as well as a means of regulating access to more private and socially important rooms in the house. The only difference was that instead of running through the center of the house, the passage at Battersea was rotated ninety degrees and extended across the front. The term "entry" has been used in this study because it is a more general term which appears in inventories of the period.¹³⁴ This division of domestic space into transitional zones of higher and lower status and the manner in which these were used to measure or indicate one's status and position echoed the manner in which salons and suites of chambers functioned in European and British formal houses.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section _8_ Page _37_

BATTERSEA

1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

The Chinese lattice staircase at Battersea is considered the richest example of its type extant in Virginia.¹³⁵ The design of the staircase was derived from plate 50 of William Halfpenny's *Rural Architecture in the Chinese Taste* (1755). Plate 50 depicts a side view of a staircase with the caption "A Stair Case in the Chinese Taste." At Battersea, two alternating lattice patterns were used on the stair ascents, and a third on the landing. The stringer and wall paneling of the stair display the use of the Greek fret derived from James Gibbs's *Rules for Drawing*. The Gibbs design was copied even to the inadvertent use of the alternative repeats of the fret in single and double forms.¹³⁶ Brandon also has an original staircase with a Chinese lattice balustrade, though of a different pattern.

The Palladian Windows

The alterations made by John Waring during his ownership of Battersea between 1841 and 1847 significantly enhanced the Palladian character of the house. Waring added the Palladian windows on the east and west pavilions of Battersea as well as the stucco over the entire building. Palladian windows, also known as Venetian windows, had been a hallmark feature of Neo-Palladian manor houses in Britain since the beginning of the Palladian Revival movement. They were typically placed on pavilions as demonstrated by Houghton Hall (begun 1722) as well as its elevation drawing in *Vitruvius Britannicus*. The same is true for Holkham Hall, Norfolk (begun 1734), and Harewood House, West Yorkshire (begun 1758). The practice of putting Palladian windows on pavilions was so common that it almost became cliché. British architectural historian Sir John Summerson alludes to this in a passage regarding the Palladian movement:

The Palladian movement could never spread its wings in the Baroque-Rococo air of the European tradition, by now so decoratively fluent. It was a clipped style. Always it was the *unit* which was precious – the single pavilion containing a single Venetian window; the single room, fitted into a jigsaw of other single rooms, all proportioned according to the elementary but strict Palladian code.¹³⁷

Even though Palladian windows became closely associated with the Federal style (c. 1780-1825) the fact that John Waring added them to a house during the 1840s – about 130 years after they had become the fashion in England – testifies to the extraordinary longevity of Palladian Revival influence in Virginia.

The Exterior Stucco

Battersea was already seventy years old when the stucco was added to the exterior in the 1840s. By that time, the practice of applying stucco over brickwork and then scoring it to look like ashlar masonry had become widely popular. The use of stucco over brick during the 18th century was much more rare, though some houses, like Menokin in Richmond County, were intended to have stucco from the beginning. During the first decades of the 19th century, the use of scored stucco became increasingly popular for houses built in the neoclassical styles of the period. By the 1840s, the use of stucco had become closely associated with the Greek Revival style. At Battersea, the application of stucco to the exterior had the effect of enhancing the Palladian style of the house. Palladio used stucco on many of his own buildings to convey the appearance of stone.¹³⁸

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 8 Page 38

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE

The 1989 and 1992-93 archaeological studies by the William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research indicate that Battersea has both prehistoric and historic archaeological significance. The discovery of quartz and quartzite flakes and chipping debris indicates the existence of a Woodland Period (1200 B.C. – 1600 A.D.) procurement camp, or lithic workshop, at or near the house. The excavation of architectural debris and domestic refuse from the 18th, and 19th centuries reflects the habitation of Battersea by the Banister, May, and Waring families during the period between 1768 and 1847. The architectural fragments confirm that Battersea underwent numerous episodes of repair and remodeling that correspond in date and sequence to the successive owners of the property. The type and quality of the ceramic and glass fragments confirms the gentry status of the Banister family as well as the slightly lower, but still upper-class, socioeconomic status of the May and Waring families. Finally, the distribution pattern of the domestic refuse indicates that the west yard functioned as a service yard during the late-18th and early-19th centuries. The 1989 and 1992-93 archaeological investigations at Battersea have supported and confirmed previous findings regarding the architectural history of the house and the families who lived there, providing a more fully integrated and comprehensive understanding of the history of Battersea.

Since the Battersea property has not been significantly altered, it retains a high degree of integrity and potential for future archaeological investigations. The terraced south yard of the mansion is believed to have been an extensive formal garden perhaps similar to the reconstructed garden at Bacon's Castle. It has excellent potential as a future site for garden archaeology and to yield information regarding late-18th and early-19th century landscape design in Virginia. Furthermore, since Battersea was occupied by the British during the Revolutionary War on three occasions and was the site of a British camp, there is a strong possibility that Revolutionary War-era artifacts may be found on the property.

ENDNOTES

¹ Calder Loth, "Palladio in Southside Virginia: Brandon and Battersea," in *Building by the Book*, vol 1 ed. Mario di Valmarana (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1986), p. 35.

² Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Report prepared for the Friends of Battersea Committee, Historic Petersburg Foundation, Inc., (Petersburg, Virginia, 1988), Chapter III, pp. 41-42.

³ "Battersea Building," *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, 3 January 1993.

⁴ Calder Loth, "Palladio in Southside Virginia: Brandon and Battersea," in *Building by the Book*, vol 1, p. 37.

⁵ Mark Girouard, *Life In the English Country House*, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1978), pp. 218-220.

⁶ Petersburg Hustings Court, Deed Bk. 67, p. 486, Petersburg, Virginia, 1904.

⁷ Frederick Horner, *The History of the Blair, Banister, and Braxton Families* (Philadelphia: J.B. Libincott Co., 1898), p. 97.

⁸ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Chapter VI, p. 6.

⁹ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Chapter VI, p. 5.

¹⁰ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Chapter VI, pp. 5-6.

¹¹ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Chapter II, p. 1.

¹² Petersburg Hustings Court, Deed Bk. 26, p. 302, Petersburg, Virginia, 1860.

¹³ Frederick Horner, *The History of the Blair, Banister, and Braxton Families*, pp. 96-97.

¹⁴ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Chapter II, p. 2.

¹⁵ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Chapter II, p. 3.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 8 Page 39

BATTERSEA

1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

-
- ¹⁶ Thomas F. Higgins III and Robert R. Hunter, Jr., "Archaeological Investigations at Battersea: Examination of Yard Areas Adjacent to the East and West Pavilions," (Submitted to Petersburg Museums, City of Petersburg, Petersburg, Virginia; Submitted by William and Mary Archaeological Project Center, Department of Anthropology, The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia, 1989), p. 10.
- ¹⁷ Thomas F. Higgins III and Robert R. Hunter, Jr., "Archaeological Investigations at Battersea . . .," (1989), p. 36.
- ¹⁸ Thomas F. Higgins III and Robert R. Hunter, Jr., "Archaeological Investigations at Battersea . . .," (1989), p. 28.
- ¹⁹ Bill Atkinson, "Artifacts No Surprise to Expert," *The Progress-Index*, (Petersburg, Virginia), no date.
- ²⁰ Thomas F. Higgins III and Robert R. Hunter, Jr., "Archaeological Investigations at Battersea . . .," (1989), p. 15.
- ²¹ Thomas F. Higgins III and Robert R. Hunter, Jr., "Archaeological Investigations at Battersea . . .," (1989), pp. 36-38.
- ²² Thomas F. Higgins III and Robert R. Hunter, Jr., "Archaeological Investigations at Battersea . . .," (1989), p. 15.
- ²³ Thomas F. Higgins III and Robert R. Hunter, Jr., "Archaeological Investigations at Battersea . . .," (1989), p. 27.
- ²⁴ Thomas F. Higgins III and Robert R. Hunter, Jr., "Archaeological Investigations at Battersea . . .," (1989), p. 16.
- ²⁵ Thomas F. Higgins III and Robert R. Hunter, Jr., "Archaeological Investigations at Battersea . . .," (1989), p. 14.
- ²⁶ Thomas F. Higgins III, "Archaeological Investigations at Battersea: Examination of the East, West, and North Porch Areas," (Submitted to Historic Petersburg Foundation, Inc., City of Petersburg City Hall Annex, Petersburg, Virginia; Submitted by William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research, Department of Anthropology, The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia, 1993), pp. 20, 22.
- ²⁷ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Chapter I, p. 5.
- ²⁸ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Chapter I, p. 2.
- ²⁹ James G. Scott and Edward A. Wyatt IV, *Petersburg's Story A History* (Petersburg, Virginia: Titmus Optical Company, 1960; reprint ed., Richmond, Virginia: The Dietz Press, 1998), p. 13.
- ³⁰ James G. Scott and Edward A. Wyatt IV, *Petersburg's Story A History*, p. 19.
- ³¹ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Chapter I, p. 7.
- ³² Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Chapter I, p. 6.
- ³³ James G. Scott and Edward A. Wyatt IV, *Petersburg's Story A History*, p. 18.
- ³⁴ Sara B. Bearss, John T. Kneebone, J. Jefferson Looney, Brent Tarter, and Sandra Gioia Treadway, ed., *Dictionary of Virginia Biography*, Vol. 2 (Richmond, Virginia: The Library of Virginia, 2001), p. 315.
- ³⁵ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Chapter I, p. 12.
- ³⁶ Sara B. Bearss et al., *Dictionary of Virginia Biography*, Vol. 2, p. 315.
- ³⁷ Sara B. Bearss et al., *Dictionary of Virginia Biography*, Vol. 2, p. 315.
- ³⁸ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Chapter I, p. 11.
- ³⁹ James G. Scott and Edward A. Wyatt IV, *Petersburg's Story A History*, p. 31.
- ⁴⁰ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Chapter I, p. 12.
- ⁴¹ Sara B. Bearss et al., *Dictionary of Virginia Biography*, Vol. 2, p. 316.
- ⁴² Sara B. Bearss et al., *Dictionary of Virginia Biography*, Vol. 2, p. 315.
- ⁴³ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Appendix V, p. 9; [John Fitzpatrick, ed., *The Writings of George Washington* (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1934). Vol. XI, p. 284.]
- ⁴⁴ Sara B. Bearss et al., *Dictionary of Virginia Biography*, Vol. 2, p. 315.
- ⁴⁵ Sara B. Bearss et al., *Dictionary of Virginia Biography*, Vol. 2, p. 316.
- ⁴⁶ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Chapter I, p. 9.
- ⁴⁷ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Chapter I, p. 9.
- ⁴⁸ James G. Scott and Edward A. Wyatt IV, *Petersburg's Story A History*, pp. 21, 27.
- ⁴⁹ Robert P. Davis, *The Revolutionary War Battle of Petersburg 25 April 1781* (Petersburg, Virginia: E. & R. Davis, 2002), p. 4.
- ⁵⁰ Daughters of the American Revolution, Francis Bland Randolph Chapter, Battersea Plaque (Battersea, Petersburg, 1911).
- ⁵¹ Robert P. Davis, *The Revolutionary War Battle of Petersburg 25 April 1781*, pp. 7, 10.
- ⁵² Robert P. Davis, *The Revolutionary War Battle of Petersburg 25 April 1781*, pp. 8, 9.
- ⁵³ Robert P. Davis, Telephone Interview, 9 August 2005.
- ⁵⁴ City of Petersburg, Virginia. www.petersburg-va.org/revwar/battle.htm. 20 July 2005.
- ⁵⁵ City of Petersburg, Virginia. www.petersburg-va.org/revwar/battle.htm. 20 July 2005.
- ⁵⁶ Robert P. Davis, *The Revolutionary War Battle of Petersburg 25 April 1781*, p. 23.
- ⁵⁷ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Appendix V, p. 12.
- ⁵⁸ Historic American Buildings Survey, "Battersea, Petersburg, Virginia," Habs. No. VA-136 (Washington, D.C., 1941), p. 4.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 8 Page 40

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

-
- ⁵⁹ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Chapter I, p. 9.
- ⁶⁰ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Appendix V, p. 12.
- ⁶¹ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Appendix V, p. 10.
- ⁶² James G. Scott and Edward A. Wyatt IV, *Petersburg's Story A History*, p. 31.
- ⁶³ Edward A. Wyatt IV, *Along Petersburg Streets* (Richmond, Virginia: The Dietz Printing Company, 1943), p. 20.
- ⁶⁴ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Appendix V, p. 13.
- ⁶⁵ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Appendix V, p. 13.
- ⁶⁶ Edward A. Wyatt IV, *Along Petersburg Streets*, p. 24.
- ⁶⁷ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Appendix V, p. 15. [Marquis de Chastellux, *Travels in North America in the Years 1780, 1781 and 1782*, rpt., (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1963), pp. 424-426.]
- ⁶⁸ Sara B. Bearss et al., *Dictionary of Virginia Biography*, Vol. 2, p. 316.
- ⁶⁹ Sara B. Bearss et al., *Dictionary of Virginia Biography*, Vol. 2, p. 316.
- ⁷⁰ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Chapter I, p. 8.
- ⁷¹ Historic American Buildings Survey, "Battersea, Petersburg, Virginia," Habs. No. VA-136, p. 3.
- ⁷² Sara B. Bearss et al., *Dictionary of Virginia Biography*, Vol. 2, p. 316.
- ⁷³ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Chapter I, p. 13.
- ⁷⁴ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Chapter III, p. 8.
- ⁷⁵ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Chapter III, p. 2; Chapter VII, p. 3.
- ⁷⁶ Ashley M. Neville, "North Battersea/Pride's Field Historic District, National Register Nomination" (Richmond, Virginia, 2004, Virginia Department of Historic Resources File No. 123-5035), p. 34.
- ⁷⁷ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Chapter III, p. 12.
- ⁷⁸ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Chapter III, p. 14.
- ⁷⁹ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Chapter III, p. 14.
- ⁸⁰ James S. Ackerman, *The Villa: Form and Ideology of Country Houses* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1990), p. 89.
- ⁸¹ Olive Cook, *The English Country House* (London: Thames and Hudson Limited, 1974), p. 122.
- ⁸² Nicholas Cooper, *Houses of the Gentry 1480-1680* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1999), p. 189.
- ⁸³ John Summerson, *Architecture in Britain 1530-1830* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 9th ed., 1993), p. 147.
- ⁸⁴ Mark Girouard, *Life In the English Country House* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1978), p. 122.
- ⁸⁵ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Chapter III, p. 4.
- ⁸⁶ Mark Girouard, *Life In the English Country House*, p. 126.
- ⁸⁷ Mark Girouard, *Life In the English Country House*, p. 126.
- ⁸⁸ Mark Girouard, *Life In the English Country House*, p. 128.
- ⁸⁹ Mark Girouard, *Life In the English Country House*, p. 132.
- ⁹⁰ Mark Girouard, *Life In the English Country House*, p. 128.
- ⁹¹ Mark Girouard, *Life In the English Country House*, p. 129.
- ⁹² Mark Girouard, *Life In the English Country House*, pp. 129-130.
- ⁹³ Mark Girouard, *Life In the English Country House*, p. 144.
- ⁹⁴ Mark Girouard, *Life In the English Country House*, p. 145.
- ⁹⁵ Mark Girouard, *Life In the English Country House*, p. 158.
- ⁹⁶ Mark Girouard, *Life In the English Country House*, p. 326.
- ⁹⁷ John Summerson, *Architecture in Britain 1530-1830*, p. 303.
- ⁹⁸ John Summerson, *Architecture in Britain 1530-1830*, pp. 302-303.
- ⁹⁹ John Summerson, *Architecture in Britain 1530-1830*, p. 304.
- ¹⁰⁰ American architectural historian Dr. Rudolf Wittkower has suggested that Leoni's 1715 date for the title page is false. He states, "Leoni's *Palladio* appeared in installments over five years, the first coming out in 1716. This can be proved beyond doubt, but Leoni put on the title-page the date 1715 – because, I believe, he did not want to be preceded by Colin Campbell so that his own role as prime rejuvenator of British architecture would not be questioned by posterity." [Rudolf Wittkower, *Palladio and Palladianism* (New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1974), p. 80.]
- ¹⁰¹ John Summerson, *Architecture in Britain 1530-1830*, p. 338.
- ¹⁰² John Summerson, *Architecture in Britain 1530-1830*, p. 339.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 8 Page 41

BATTERSEA

1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

-
- ¹⁰³ Eileen Harris, assisted by Nicholas Savage, *British Architectural Books and Writers, 1556-1785* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 318.
- ¹⁰⁴ John Summerson, *Architecture in Britain 1530-1830*, p. 339.
- ¹⁰⁵ Adolf K. Placzek, Forward to *Select Architecture*, 1970. Robert Morris, *Select Architecture*, 2nd ed. (London: Robert Sayer, 1757; reprint ed., New York: Da Capo Press, 1973).
- ¹⁰⁶ Steven Parissien, E-mail communication to Dr. Charles Brownell, Department of Art History, Virginia Commonwealth University, 10 June 2005.
- ¹⁰⁷ Mary Cosh, "Lord Ilay's Eccentric Building Schemes," *Country Life*, Vol. 152, 20 July 1972, pp. 142-145.
- ¹⁰⁸ Carl R. Lounsbury, *The Courthouses of Early Virginia* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2005), p. 173.
- ¹⁰⁹ Carl R. Lounsbury, *The Courthouses of Early Virginia*, p. 173.
- ¹¹⁰ Carl R. Lounsbury, *The Courthouses of Early Virginia*, p. 181.
- ¹¹¹ Carl R. Lounsbury, *The Courthouses of Early Virginia*, p. 187.
- ¹¹² Steven Parissien, E-mail communication to Dr. Charles Brownell, 10 June 2005.
- ¹¹³ Calder Loth, "Palladio in Southside Virginia: Brandon and Battersea," in *Building by the Book*, vol. 1, p. 27.
- ¹¹⁴ Thomas T. Waterman, *The Mansions of Virginia: 1706-1776* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1947), p. 380.
- ¹¹⁵ Calder Loth, "Palladio in Southside Virginia: Brandon and Battersea," in *Building by the Book*, vol. 1, p. 27.
- ¹¹⁶ Thomas T. Waterman, *The Mansions of Virginia: 1706-1776*, p. 380.
- ¹¹⁷ Thomas T. Waterman, *The Mansions of Virginia: 1706-1776*, p. 364.
- ¹¹⁸ Charles E. Brownell, Calder Loth, William M.S. Rasmussen, Richard Guy Wilson, *The Making of Virginia Architecture* (Richmond, Virginia: Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, 1992), p. 198.
- ¹¹⁹ Thomas T. Waterman, *The Mansions of Virginia: 1706-1776*, p. 378.
- ¹²⁰ Thomas T. Waterman, *The Mansions of Virginia: 1706-1776*, p. 381.
- ¹²¹ Charles E. Brownell, Calder Loth, William M.S. Rasmussen, Richard G. Wilson, *The Making of Virginia Architecture*, p. 198.
- ¹²² Calder Loth, "Palladio in Southside Virginia: Brandon and Battersea," in *Building by the Book*, vol. 1, p. 30.
- ¹²³ Mills Lane, *Architecture of the Old South, Virginia* (Savannah, Georgia: The Beehive Press, 1987), p. 82.
- ¹²⁴ Calder Loth, "Palladio in Southside Virginia: Brandon and Battersea," in *Building by the Book*, vol. 1, p. 30.
- ¹²⁵ Calder Loth, "Palladio in Southside Virginia: Brandon and Battersea," in *Building by the Book*, vol. 1, p. 30.
- ¹²⁶ Mills Lane, *Architecture of the Old South, Virginia*, p. 82.
- ¹²⁷ Calder Loth, "Palladio in Southside Virginia: Brandon and Battersea," in *Building by the Book*, vol. 1, p. 34.
- ¹²⁸ Calder Loth, "Palladio in Southside Virginia: Brandon and Battersea," in *Building by the Book*, vol. 1, p. 35.
- ¹²⁹ Henry Glassie, "Virginia Vernacular," Lecture given at National Trust Conference, Washington, D.C., 23 October 1999.
- ¹³⁰ Charles E. Brownell, Calder Loth, William M.S. Rasmussen, Richard G. Wilson, *The Making of Virginia Architecture*, p. 198.
- ¹³¹ Christian Norberg-Schulz, *Baroque Architecture* (Milan, Italy: Electra Editrice, 1979; reprint ed., New York: Rizzoli International Publications, Inc., 1986), p. 162.
- ¹³² Mark Girouard, *Life In the English Country House*, p. 162.
- ¹³³ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Chapter III, p. 2.
- ¹³⁴ Willie Graham and Mark R. Wenger, "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study," Chapter III, p. 4.
- ¹³⁵ Calder Loth, "Palladio in Southside Virginia: Brandon and Battersea," in *Building by the Book*, vol 1, p. 38.
- ¹³⁶ Thomas T. Waterman, *The Mansions of Virginia: 1706-1776*, p. 376.
- ¹³⁷ John Summerson, *Architecture in Britain 1530-1830*, p. 322.
- ¹³⁸ William M.S. Rasmussen, "Palladio in Tidewater Virginia: Mount Airy and Blandfield," in *Building by the Book*, vol 1 ed. Mario di Valmarana (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1986), p. 80.

NPS Form 10-900-a
(8-86)

OMB No. 1024-0018

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 8 Page 42

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 8 Page 43

BATTERSEA
1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

9. BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

- Ackerman, James S. *The Villa: Form and Ideology of Country Houses*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Architects' Emergency Committee. *Great Georgian Houses of America*. Vol. I. New York: the Kalkhoff Press, Inc., 1933; reprint ed., New York: Dover Publications, 1970.
- _____. *Great Georgian Houses of America*. Vol. II. New York: Scribner Press, 1937; reprint ed., New York: Dover Publications, 1970.
- Atkinson, Bill. "Artifacts No Surprise to Expert." *The Progress-Index*. Petersburg, Virginia. No date.
- "Battersea Building." *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, 3 January 1993.
- Bearss, Sara B.; Kneebone, John T.; Looney, J. Jefferson; Tarter, Brent; and Treadway, Sandra Gioia, ed. *Dictionary of Virginia Biography*. Vol. 2. Richmond, Virginia: The Library of Virginia, 2001.
- Beers, W.F. *Topographical Map of Petersburg, Dinwiddie Co., Va.* 1877.
- Brownell, Charles E.; Loth, Calder; Rasmussen, William M.S.; Wilson, Richard Guy. *The Making of Virginia Architecture*. Richmond, Virginia: Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, 1992.
- City of Petersburg, Virginia. www.petersburg-va.org/revwar/battle.htm. 20 July 2005.
- Cook, Olive. *The English Country House*. London: Thames and Hudson Limited, 1974.
- Cooper, Nicholas. *Houses of the Gentry 1480-1680*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1999.
- Cosh, Mary. "Lord Ilay's Eccentric Building Schemes." *County Life*, Vol. 152, 20 July 1972, pp. 142-145.
- Davis, Robert P. *The Revolutionary War Battle of Petersburg 25 April 1781*. Petersburg, Virginia: E. & R. Davis, 2002.
- _____. Telephone Interview, 9 August 2005.
- Daughters of the American Revolution, Francis Bland Randolph Chapter. Battersea Plaque. Battersea, Petersburg, 1911.
- Deed. Waring to Boisseau. Petersburg Hustings Court, Deed Bk. 16 pp. 498-500. Petersburg, Virginia, 25 November 1847.
- Deed. Petersburg Hustings Court, Deed Bk. 67, p. 486. Petersburg, Virginia, 1904.
- Deed. Petersburg Hustings Court, Deed Bk. 26, p. 302. Petersburg, Virginia, 1860.
- Girouard, Mark. *Life In the English Country House*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1978.
- Glassie, Henry. "Virginia Vernacular." Lecture given at the National Trust for Historic Preservation Conference, Washington, D.C., 23 October 1999.
- Graham, Willie and Wenger, Mark R. "Battersea A Historical and Architectural Study." Report prepared for the Friends of Battersea Committee, Historic Petersburg Foundation, Inc., Petersburg, Virginia, 1988.
- Graham, Willie. "Recent Discoveries at Battersea." Unpublished memo for Battersea Committee, located in Preservation Planner's Office, City of Petersburg, Virginia, 1989.
- Green, Bryan Clark. "Defending the Ancients: The Architectural Theory of Robert Morris." *American Arts Quarterly* 20 (Winter 2003): 23-32.
- Harris, Eileen, assisted by Nicholas Savage. *British Architectural Books and Writers, 1556-1785*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Higgins, Thomas F. III and Hunter, Robert R., Jr. "Archaeological Investigations at Battersea: Examination of Yard Areas Adjacent to the East and West Pavilions." Submitted to Petersburg Museums, City of Petersburg, Petersburg, Virginia. Submitted by William and Mary Archaeological Project Center, Department of Anthropology, The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia, 1989.
- Higgins, Thomas F. III. "Archaeological Investigations at Battersea: Examination of the East, West, and North Porch Areas." Submitted to Historic Petersburg Foundation, Inc., City of Petersburg City Hall annex, Petersburg, Virginia. Submitted by William and Mary Center for Archaeological Research, Department of Anthropology, The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia, 1993.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet
Section 8 Page 44

BATTERSEA

1289 Upper Appomattox Street; Petersburg, Virginia

-
- Historic American Buildings Survey. Battersea, Petersburg, Virginia. Habs. No. VA-136. Washington, D.C., 1941.
- Horner, Frederick. *The History of the Blair, Banister, and Braxton Families*. Philadelphia: J.B. Libincott Co., 1898.
- Lane, Mills. *Architecture of the Old South, Virginia*. Savannah, Georgia: The Beehive Press, 1986.
- _____. *Architecture of the Old South, Maryland*. Savannah, Georgia: The Beehive Press, 1991.
- Loth, Calder. "Palladio in Southside Virginia: Brandon and Battersea." In *Building by the Book*, vol 1, pp. 25-39. Edited by Mario di Valmarana. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1986.
- Loth, Calder, ed. *Virginia Landmarks Register*. 4th ed. Charlottesville and London: The University Press of Virginia, 1999.
- Lounsbury, Carl R. *The Courthouses of Early Virginia*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2005.
- McAlester, Virginia and Lee. *A Field Guide to American Houses*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1984.
- Morris, Robert. *Select Architecture*. 2nd ed. London: Robert Sayer, 1757; reprint ed., New York: Da Capo Press, 1973.
- Neville, Ashley M. "North Battersea/Pride's Field Historic District, National Register Nomination." Richmond, Virginia, 2004. Virginia Department of Historic Resources File No. 123-5035.
- Norberg-Schulz, Christian. *Baroque Architecture*. Milan, Italy: Electra Editrice, 1979; reprint ed., New York: Rizzoli International Publications, Inc., 1986.
- Panbehchi, Michael. "Battersea: An Historical Introduction." A Project Prepared under the Direction of Dr. Charles Brownell in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for ARTH 502: Historic Preservation and Architectural History. Department of Art History, Virginia Commonwealth University, Spring 2004.
- Parissien, Steven. E-mail to Dr. Charles Brownell, Dept. of Art History, Virginia Commonwealth University, 10 June 2005.
- Quiney, Anthony. *The Traditional Buildings of England*. London: Thames & Hudson Ltd., 1990.
- Rasmussen, William M.S. "Palladio in Tidewater Virginia: Mount Airy and Blandfield." In *Building by the Book*, vol 1, pp. 75-109. Edited by Mario di Valmarana. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1986.
- Scott, James G. and Wyatt, Edward A., IV. *Petersburg's Story A History*. Petersburg, Virginia: Titmus Optical company, 1960; reprint ed., Richmond, Virginia: The Dietz Press, 1998.
- Summerson, John. *Architecture in Britain 1530-1830*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, ninth edition, 1993.
- Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission. "Battersea National Register Nomination." Richmond, Virginia, 1969. Virginia Department of Historic Resources File No. 123-59.
- Waterman, Thomas T. *The Mansions of Virginia: 1706-1776*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1947.
- Watkin, David. *A History of Western Architecture*. New York: Thames & Hudson, 1986.
- Wittkower, Rudolf. *Palladio and Palladianism*. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1974.
- Wundram, Manfred and Pape, Thomas. *Andrea Palladio 1508-1580 Architect between the Renaissance and Baroque*. London, Los Angeles: Taschen, 2004.
- Wyatt, Edward A., IV. *Along Petersburg Streets*. Richmond, Virginia: The Dietz Printing Company, 1943.

10. BOUNDARY JUSTIFICATION

The Battersea nomination consists of two separate parcels that historically comprised the Battersea estate. The largest parcel contains the main house and is 31 acres. The smaller parcel contains a former tenant house and is 4.5 acres. The total size of the Battersea nomination is 35.5 acres. The two parcels, as well as a 2-acre parcel not included in this nomination, were conveyed to the City of Petersburg by the former owners in 1985 as recorded in Deedbook 416, pp. 485, 486.